

situation, apparently he was assigned to the infantry. As his letter indicates, he made many requests for training in the infantry and in infantry weapons, but was told that they had no time for that kind of training. Finally he was sent into action. The Senator from California will read all those details in the letter.

I shall be very happy to furnish the Senate Armed Services Committee with a copy of the letter which I hope to receive from General Collins.

I suppose I shall be told that this is an isolated or unique case—as it well may be. However, it is tragic that this situation should occur in even one case, and that a young officer should be denied the training for which he repeatedly asked before he was sent into combat.

The first paragraph of his letter is very interesting, and I shall read it into the RECORD at this point:

I've been planning on writing you a letter for some time, then I thought I'd play the part of a martyr by penning a letter and having it sent to you if I were killed. I decided today I might save somebody else's life if I wrote now.

The letter was written the day before he went into his first combat assignment, as a combat officer, in a completely strange situation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 24), 1952:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William Joseph Fleniken, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice Harvey L. Carey, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James Clement Noonan, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota, vice Theodore B. Werner, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in this moment of prayer, may our spirits be brought into a blessed harmony with Thy spirit and into a glad obedience to Thy holy will.

We penitently confess that our lives, our plans, and purposes are often at variance with the ways which Thou hast marked out for us.

Grant that in the business of statecraft we may have the common sense

and wisdom to recognize our dependence upon Thee.

May it be the goal of all our efforts and endeavors to do those things that are well pleasing unto Thee. May we be confident that the day is coming when the forces of reason and righteousness shall be gloriously triumphant.

In Christ's name 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. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5715. An act to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 2743. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2408. An act to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts; and

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1952

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5715, an act to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL ATTACHÉS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2737, an act to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "during the fiscal year 1948" and insert "prior to March 2, 1948."

Page 2, line 5, after "validated," insert "All payments made under the provisions of this act shall be made from, and all payments validated under such provisions shall be charged to, the amount appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, to the Department of the Navy for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the act of August 2, 1946."

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

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas would explain to the House the benefits of these Senate amendments.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves approximately \$50,000. It is to reimburse certain naval attachés and others on missions abroad, who paid certain expenses of their missions. Under one appropriation bill, the Comptroller General held it was not payable. The bill would reimburse that \$50,000. The Senate amendment requires that that sum be paid out of current appropriation rather than a subsequent appropriation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted a consent request in connection with the rule on the omnibus judgeship bill that further consideration of the rule be postponed until today. I had temporarily forgotten that there are primaries today in Wisconsin and Nebraska in connection with the election of delegates to the two national conventions. We have a gentleman's agreement, of course, that on such occasions no matter in what State an election be held, no roll call will take place. I assume there will be a roll call on the rule. In view of that I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the rule, House Resolution 591, be postponed until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ROLL CALLS POSTPONED UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Further if I may, with permission of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts and the indulgence of the House, I ask unanimous consent that should there be any roll call, as distinguished from a quorum call, on any matter during the day that the roll call be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, do I understand in connection with the gentleman's request on the rule on the judgeship bill that it will be called up again tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the intention—just on the adoption of the rule but not consideration in the Committee of the Whole after the rule is adopted.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE SCOUT HOSPITAL, FORT MCKINLEY, PHILIPPINES

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1216) to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "Seventy-sixth" and insert "Seventy-eighth."

Page 3, line 11, after "conditions", insert "and limitations."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, the only changes in the bill as it passed the House are these: The first amendment merely corrects a figure. The second is, according to the Senate amendment, to make clear that the implementation of the program contemplated by the bill will give the President the authority to require that hospital costs be kept within reasonable limitations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was the original intention?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ALEXANDER NEWMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Alexander Newman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alexander Newman, of Rochester, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, the sum of \$1,032. Such payment represents the amount due for per diem in lieu of subsistence from October 20, 1944, to October 17, 1945, while an employee of the War Department, and for mileage at 4½ cents per mile for use of a privately owned automobile for some 2,700 miles: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARK G. RUSHMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mark G. Rushmann, of 502 South Main Street, Chippewa Falls, Wis., the sum of \$7,093 as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him at the Madison, Wis., railroad station on December 22, 1945, the day following the date of his discharge from the United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PAULINE J. GOURDEAUX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 858) for the relief of Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux, of Denver, Col., the sum of \$1,252.20, representing the amount of pension she would have received for the period beginning on January 28, 1945, and ending on April 10, 1947, had her claim for a dependent parent's pension been filed within 1 year after January 28, 1945, the date fixed by the War Department as the date of death of Pfc Edward E. Gourdeaux: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTHER V. WORLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 970) for the relief of Esther V. Worley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any liability to the United States resulting from over-payments in retired pay aggregating \$1,209.60 made to Esther V. Worley, Nurse Corps, United States Naval Reserve, for the period from December 15, 1947, through August 31, 1948, as a result of receipt by the said Esther V. Worley of retired pay and Federal civil-service pay concurrently, is hereby canceled.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE W. WIMBERLY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1458) for the relief of Joe W. Wimberly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joe W. Wimberly, of Kingsport, Tenn., the sum of \$3,400, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for medical, nursing, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred near Franklin, Ga., on April 28, 1950, while he was returning to Kingsport from a training conference at Fort Benning, Ga., in connection with his duties as commanding officer, Six Hundred and Thirty-ninth Transportation Heavy Truck Company: *Provided*, That no part of the

amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUMAN W. MCCULLOUGH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1604) for the relief of Truman W. McCullough.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Truman W. McCullough, of Colorado Springs, Colo., the sum of \$5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Truman W. McCullough against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Harley Beryl McCullough, who died as a result of burns sustained while fighting a forest fire as a volunteer fire fighter, at Camp Carson, Colo., on January 17, 1950: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANSY E. PENDERGRASS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Pansy E. Pendergrass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pansy E. Pendergrass, of Columbia, S. C., the sum of \$10,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for injuries suffered by her in a fire which occurred in the hotel in which she was billeted in Kobe, Japan, on April 22, 1950: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL J. CROWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1682) for the relief of Daniel J. Crowley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel J. Crowley, 225 Frye Avenue, Peoria, Ill., the sum of \$4,439.10 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical, nursing, and hospital expenses suffered by him as the result of being hospitalized with poliomyelitis on April 1, 1946, while on authorized leave from his duties as a commissioned officer in the United States Naval Reserve: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. HIBBS BUCKMAN AND A. RAYMOND RAFF, JR., EXECUTORS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1998) for the relief of J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors of the estate of A. Raymond Raff, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors under the will of A. Raymond Raff, deceased, the sum of \$2,217.86. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the National City Bank of New York, New York, and Banco da Madeira, Funchal, Madeira, and their agents, successors, or correspondents against the United States, the Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America as surety on the bond of A. Raymond Raff, deceased formerly collector of customs at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., and the estate of the said A. Raymond Raff for loss caused by the unlawful sale on July 17, 1947, of two cases of handkerchiefs consigned to the National City Bank of New York, New York, which were sold as unclaimed merchandise before the expiration of the general-order period, as extended: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or recovered by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT JOSEPH VETTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2100) for the relief of Robert Joseph Vetter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Joseph Vetter, of Miami, Fla., the sum of \$158. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Joseph Vetter against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of his rescue of two United States Navy fliers who were fatally injured in the crash of a Navy airplane approximately 50 yards north of the recreation pier at the south end of Miami Beach, Fla., on June 5, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN L. BAUER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2157) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to private property arising from activities of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John L. Bauer, Watertown, N. Y., \$50; to Ernest Bohna, Brogan, Oreg., \$50; and to William E. Dollar, Meigs, Ga., \$98.50. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to their property caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable under any existing statute available for the settlement of claims against the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of John L. Bauer, Ernest Bohna, and William E. Dollar."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-1668413, Kehaloff, George Athanasoff.
A-7297249, Gwozdz, Jozef.
A-5760683, Czerwinski, Bronislawa or Lon (nee Markowska).
A-9098321, Czerwinski, Jan.
A-5043634, Lago, Ramon Formosa.
A-6742652, Blich, Mina.
A-6622741, Blich, Aron.
A-3030092, Martinez-Martinez, Jose, or Joe Martina.
A-2612961, Kimura, Yukiko.
A-2757718, Cheng, Chi Chiao, or Steven Cheng.
A-7190316, Diciaccio, Ottavio.
A-6761996, Rosenstein, Max David.
A-6207651, McMahan, Glenn Madge Mearns.
A-6492272, Alcantar, Esmeregildo.
A-7197683, Arias-Olivares, Bencelada, or Wenceslada Arias-Olivares.
A-6953567, Augustin, Margaret Tatiano San (nee Reyes).
A-5916158, Benjamin, Mary Jane (nee Hyndman).
A-485628, Bergondo, Lucia (nee Monzon).
A-5763425, Bewley, Theresa Athne, or Theresa Athne Bosserman (nee Thompson).
A-7135004, Bijarakis, Irene Emmanuel (nee Irene Emmanuel Tzanetes).
A-7450259, Borrelli, Antonietta (nee Franco).
A-3328605, Bourlon, Paul Edward.
A-3284813, Brewster, Albert Sydney, or Sidney Brewster.
A-1425339, Brezez, Mario.
A-4102898, Campbell, Arthur Joshua.
A-7417748, Campbell, George.
A-7267869, Carini, John (Giovanni).
A-7267870, Carini, Anna Angela.
A-7375502, Cesarini, Domenico Mario, or Domenico M. Cesarini.
A-4471755, Chung, Margaret Mary, or Margaret Mary Ping Shan Chung, or Ching Ping Shan.
A-5058193, Cohn, Sonia, or Sonia Fidler.
A-7463869, Connor, Albert, Marfunt.
A-6781701, Correa, Eduardo Juan, or Marcellino Bellino.
A-2658342, Csung, Eng Ki, alias Wou Ki Csung.
A-1236060, Dobos, Joseph (Jozsef or Joe).
A-1050228, D'Ambro, Raffaele.
A-2396446, DeAyala, Genoveva Martinez.
A-7858213, DeJuarez, Elioia Navarrete.
A-7274225, DeOntiveros, Concepcion Amancio.
A-7073390, Dery, Liliane Marcelle, formerly Liliane Marcelle Charbonnier.
A-5339551, Detels, Heinrich Hans.
A-5257867, DiMeglio, Giovanni.
A-1363644, Dim'trakoulakos, Dimitrios, or Jimmie Demos.
A-7415149, Dobson, Keith Frederick.
A-1019415, Docherty, Rebecca.
A-1962682, Dracopoulos, Peter Constantine.
A-1263600, Elizalde, Luz Peinado.
A-1916314, Farganis, Pericles A.
A-6319163, Ferszt, Szyje, or Sidney First.
A-4445754, Foti, Carmelo.
A-666527, Frain, Christina Elizabeth May (nee Tornbull).
A-7117918, Francis, Therza Hayden (nee Billingham).
A-4566242, Franek, Shirley Sa.

A-1504362, Frano, Raffaele Angelo, or Raffaele Frano, or Ralph Frano.
A-7934330, Fulton, Victor Alexander.
A-4467600, Garcia, Manuel Ferreiro.
A-2840935, Garcia-Perez, Antonio or Arturo.
A-7886808, George, Ludrik, Kelsham.
A-7894902, George, Maria Leonora (nee Thomas).
A-3019640, Gerlich, Jakob.
A-4978213, Geiss, Lillian Florence Belle (nee England).
A-7241623, Gliszczynski, Theodore Joseph.
A-3475252, Goodman, Rose (nee Randell).
A-6491933, Gorfinkel, Chana, or Gorfinkel (nee Chana Gulevsky or Gulewska).
A-3181035, Gropsorean, Damen, alias Nicolas Thomas.
A-7174219, Grosch, Jutta (nee Jaeger).
A-5998196, Guerlisl, Lillian.
A-5131547, Halloran, Doris Helen (nee Fuller).
A-7070214, Hansen, Hans Willy, or William Hansen.
A-7375722, Heinzmann, Peter Mikulas.
A-7136914, Hodge, Daniela (Daniela Ivanka Tatjana Petrova).
A-7290260, Hodson, Kathlyn Ellen.
A-3322185, Hoffmann, Arthur Otto.
A-4870661, Hop, Louie.
A-7399533, Hoy, Lee Chee, or Calvin C. Lee.
A-6414242, Huang, Richard Shih-Chiu.
A-6414219, Huang, Robert Hal-Chuan.
A-5587447, Hulatt, Henry.
A-7115356, Hummels, Agnes Geodorovna.
A-1140841, Hutter, Joseph.
A-1481433, Hyland, Patrick Joseph.
A-3371125, Iari, Ruth Randall.
A-4946250, Jennings, Frederick H., or Albert George Brine.
A-5273968, Jensen, Rasmus Magnus.
A-9777158, Kalolekas, Vasilios Theodore.
A-2342622, Kanzaki, Kichizo, or Kichizo Fujiwara.
A-2342620, Kanzaki, Misao.
A-7008736, Kanzaki, Keiko or Kaye.
A-1032116, Karaviotis, Aristomenis, or Aristomenis Andreas Karaviotis, or Aristomenis Caraviotis.
A-5343107, Karlsson, Per, or Peter Carlson.
A-2828423, Krystalls, Gabriel Mozkoz.
A-9783023, Lejnleks, Inta.
A-2515343, Leonetti, Erna Gertrud.
A-5153032, Leskanic, Janos, or John Leskanic.
A-4754440, Levin, Esther Tillie (nee Mandel).
A-3420990, Levine, Anna.
A-5390478, Ma, Chuk Ching.
A-3445844, Maid, Mary Ann (nee Foxton).
A-5573561, Mangiarotti, Santo.
A-3378386, Matorim, Max, or Motel Matorin.
A-5515065, Matsubara, Kikuno.
A-6993697, Mattern, Reiner Karl, alias Rene Ellul.
A-5166281, Matthews, Mary, or Marja Wciaka (nee Matiasz).
A-4180577, Masters, John Richard Lenton, alias Jack Masters.
A-3635338, Meers, Margaret, or Margarethe Meers, or Margaretha Henkl (nee Boerner).
A-4679824, Michaelis, Rudolf Martin Kurt.
A-2011319, Mikulus, Michael Albert.
A-2280632, Morand, Martha Johanna, or Martha Jensen Darnell, or Martha Johanna Jensen.
A-7372123, Moreitz, Monica Johanna.
A-1339900, Moshopoulos, Gerassimos, or George Moshos.
A-5083554, Murrell, Evelyn Maud.
A-6219555, Okamatsu, Ieamu, or Ysamu Okamura, or Yoshio Monaka.
A-2749014, Omar, Mahdee Bin, or Allie Mahdee Omar.
A-3634838, Orsi, Italia (Italia Stacchetti).
A-4904454, Paolini, Attilio.
A-7809276, Pastori, Claude, or Claude Tulio Pastori.

A-5600621, Paulson, Mary Harms, or Mary Grigg.
A-4613083, Payeras, Anita Maria, or Anita Maria Rodriguez, or Anita Maria Llop.
A-4102640, Percy, George Whitfield.
A-2745227, Pelin, Neculate Oprea, or Nicholas Pelin.
A-7985396, Pentino, Carmella, formerly Consiglia Schiavone.
A-4115597, Perog, Michael.
A-7398987, Pesti, Goldie Grace, formerly Veres (nee Nays).
A-1944984, Petesic, Ivan.
A-6372739, Petkovich, Filippo, or Phillip Petrovich.
A-7197870, Petronio, Immacolato (nee Russo).
A-4850252, Petruccio, Angeline Maria (nee Pontello), alias Ines Alba De Michiel.
A-1958941, Pinakas, Maria, or Maria Kotonis, or Maria Lambadaris.
A-4371125, Pinto, Domingos Fernandez.
A-9920083, Polanowski, Stefan.
A-5419016, Poser, Erich.
A-1108990, Pragas, Vasilios Athanasios.
A-6287182, Preston, Ann.
A-4575450, Prince, Ida Beckstein.
A-4906086, Prochaska, Stefan Julian, alias Steve or Stefan Prochaska, Prochacka, or Prohacksa.
A-5662521, Raynor, Grace Annie (nee Laskie).
A-1251744, Rebeiro-Gomes, John.
A-4853529, Reder, Erna Marcelina Frankel.
A-4435161, Reder, Jacob.
A-7197883, Ritchie, Rufolpho Maria.
A-7396681, Roedelsturtz, Raymond.
A-7115216, Sager, Charles Stewart.
A-5343415, Sagris, Hilda Kristina.
A-6036900, Sang, Tung.
A-3095402, Saponzides, Seraphim Diml-trios.
A-1602221, Sarigiannis, Stylianos, alias Steve Camberis.
A-4972502, Scallan, Marcella (nee Rutkn).
A-1353207, Schoen, Eva, formerly Eva Bosko, formerly Eva Szontag (nee Eva Hauszler).
A-3197907, Shapiro, Minnie (nee Sandler).
A-4298007, Sheung, Lee Gout, or Anna Lee, or Anne Hoey.
A-5975002, Shibata, Hiroshi.
A-4708975, Silva, Philip, alias Felipe Silva, or Felipe Silva Gonzalez.
A-4135539, Sing, Lo Mang.
A-2429886, Sepicluk, Nick, or Nicolai Isepluc.
A-7491771, Smith Natalia Alexandrovna, alias Natasha Alexandrovna Smith, formerly Kulikov.
A-5907999, Sommerkamp, Arnold.
A-5213664, Steskanin, William, or Bill Stesko.
A-2098982, Stosich, Marko, or Marcos Zoyas Siles.
A-5589571, Szewczyk, Kate, alias Catherine Szewczyk.
A-5165425, Szewczyk, Ignacy.
A-5725387, Takata, Jiro, or George Takata.
A-7118500, Taveira, Maria Clothilde Martins.
A-5434215, Portis, Ruth (nee Urguhart).
A-3479202, Wang, Florence, alias Florence Piwsia Wang Teng.
A-5380160, Warren, Alice Julianne (nee Levacher or Alice Fiquet).
A-2471388, Wei Yu, Djong Wayland, or Wayland Djorg.
A-1356959, Wessel, Max George.
A-3616338, White, John Herbert.
A-4956728, Willoughby, Barbara Adice, or Alice or Barbara Adice Dalgleish (nee Word).
A-4984579, Wolhendler, David, alias David Wold.
A-2137759, Yurich, Frank.
A-3759782, Abe, Fujiye, or Fujiye Bode, or Fujiye Sakata.
A-2478324, Alves, Manuel.

- A-4079647, Anemoures, Demosthenes, Evangelos, or James Evangelos.
- A-7754257, Anglada, Manuel O. Zariquely y, or Manuel Zariquely Anglada, or Manuel O. Zariquely.
- A-3462443, Bacchione, Domenico.
- A-6160685, Bacchus, Habeeb.
- A-5811850, Baillie, Zillah.
- A-5737148, Baker, Hyman Noah, or Hymie Baker.
- A-5837681, Bartee, Elsa Anne.
- A-7096163, Beck, Elmer Into or Into Ilmar Suhonen.
- A-5401170, Bensaia, Giuseppe, or Giuseppe Bensaia, or Joseph Bensaler, or Giuseppe Bensaia.
- A-6990512, Berghoff, Jerome, or Aaron Leo Ginsberg.
- A-5796563, Block, Julia, or Sister Mary Vincentia.
- A-7176702, Bokios, Efthalia Vassilios Zer-voulia.
- A-7354859, Boluda, Louis Roger.
- A-2585736, Boyajian, Arousag, or Rose Mary Boyajian.
- A-3748687, Bridges, Frank Sherlock.
- A-5877409, Broome, Stanley George, or Stanley George Amey.
- A-7423197, Brown, Virginia Sabater (nee Sabater).
- A-7362345, Burnett, Brenda Caroline, formerly Brenda Caroline Simpson.
- A-7362346, Burnett, Glenis Pamela, formerly Glenis Pamela Simpson.
- A-6976783, Campbell, Alfred John.
- A-7043314, Campisano, Frank Anthony.
- A-7262109, Carpenter, George, or George Carpenter Passejian.
- A-7123585, Carpenter, Josephine Semone Cosand.
- A-5599299, Chao, Celia Hwa Guen, or Celia Huan.
- A-6982613, Chase, Beryl, or Beryl Small De Chase (nee Small).
- A-6982614, Chase, Yvonne Patricia.
- A-4642604, Cheong, Cheung, or Tack Chong.
- A-5757153, Cherven, Mary Sophie (nee Mary Sophie Reichel).
- A-4935364, Clarke, William John.
- A-3563403, Collazo, Maria, or Maria Paiz, or Maria Molina.
- A-1251448, Colze, Wilhelm Leo, or Wilhelm Leo-Francis Colze.
- A-5750902, Cornell, Isadore, or Isadore Kanell.
- A-6708955, Covello, Fiorentina (nee Amato).
- A-7186426, Dacey, Margaret (nee Hill).
- A-5273901, Daddow, Elizabeth Jane (nee Veale).
- A-4538840, D'Alessandro, Benedetto, or D'Alessandro Benedetto, or Benny Castell.
- A-3098806, Dapontis, George Antonios.
- A-7202716, Dawidczyk, Leokadia Ryducha, or Lucy Sarah Dawidczyk, or Leokadia Ruducha.
- A-7061272, Dazio, Chiara Angela Marina.
- A-3854994, De Esparza, Theresa Arroyo dor De Fontes.
- A-7188407, De Hernandez, Florinda Armandares.
- A-6261642, Deligianis, Maritsa.
- A-6873511, Deligianis, Eleftheria.
- A-6873512, Deligianis, George.
- A-7010933, Delisi, Wendy Teresa, formerly Pearson.
- A-4216989, De Molina, Celia Melendez, or Celia Melendez, or Celia M. Molina.
- A-5664486, De Rosales, Soledad Morones.
- A-2563522, Din, Badar Ud, or Badar Ud Din Gorsl.
- A-4693497, Drachler, Louis Davis.
- A-7224968, Durnell, Edith Marion (nee White).
- A-4161607, End, Edward.
- A-1175433, Escobedo, Maria.
- A-3394109, Eschelby, James Wesley.
- A-4408331, Faia, John.
- A-4484324, Finegood, Atty (nee Silverfarb).
- A-4943398, Fineman, Sidney.
- A-7263010, Folio, Yvette Germaine Tour-tois, or Yvette Germaine Tourtois.
- A-7263011, Folio, Gerard Michel Tourtois, or Gerard Michel Tourtois.
- A-7263012, Folio, Louis Edmond Tourtois, or Louis Edmond Tourtois.
- A-7264767, Friedmann, Eveline Henriette.
- A-1297481, Frohn, Valentine (nee Valen-tine Yu).
- A-7049286, Garza Isauero.
- A-1668107, Giorgi, Gino.
- A-1119471, Girardi, Sam.
- A-6678004, Glasman, Izak.
- A-6678020, Glasman, Jolan (nee Klein).
- A-3986030, Goby, Thomas, or "Tom" Goby.
- A-5067258, Gomez, Eduardo Bao, or Manuel Gomez.
- A-3857260, Gonzalez, Joseph Casal, or Jose Casal Gonzalez, or Joseph Gonzalez.
- A-4387257, Goodman, Max, or Motel Gont-macher.
- A-5262046, Goss, Eva Lillian (nee Pickard).
- A-7873904, Greaux, Joseph Gabriel.
- A-4284559, Green, Jack, formerly John Greenberg.
- A-4803905, Green, Dora Esther, formerly Dora Esther Greenberg (nee Serota).
- A-3257180, Greipel, Alois.
- A-3562620, Greulich, Ernest Heinrich Erich, or Ernest Erich Greulich, or Erich E. Greu-lich.
- A-7439173, Hadzicostantinou, Constanti-nos, or Constantinos Hadzicostantinou.
- A-6703140, Harris, Athanasia Constantine (nee Mallires or Athanasia Haralampopou-las).
- A-6057286, Hepworth, Norman William.
- A-6597600, Heuberg Rachel.
- A-5123964, Hirsch, Gloria Gertrude Green-berg.
- A-6623134, Hollander, Bernardo, or Bern-ardo Hollander Grun.
- A-1543051, Huber, Emil.
- A-3007292, Ibrahim, Mohamed.
- A-1883063, Imbrogno, Giulio, or Francesco Imbrogno.
- A-3834948, Inouye, Yataro, or John Yataro Inouye, or John Yataro Inoye.
- A-9798290, Inwood, Leslie Harold.
- A-2619905, Janicka, Mary, or Maryanna Witkowska, or Rogowska.
- A-1441065, Johnson, Alma.
- A-6954768, Kanellos, George Dimitrios, or George Canellos.
- A-7136803, Karas, Peggy (nee Liacopoulos or Panagiota Constantinou).
- A-4443941, Karki, Ester Marra (nee Kotala).
- A-4002885, Katchur, Rose, or Rose Sloan, or Chaya Rachel Schlaifan.
- A-6836915, Kauppi, Bengt Harry, and Bengt Harry Mattson.
- A-1070225, Kazias, Vasilios Kosmas.
- A-6441569, Kessler, Reginald R.
- A-6928172, Khade, Miriam Anton.
- A-6928173, Khader, Anton Elias S. Khalil, or Anton E. Khader, or Anton Khader.
- A-5613065, Kivinen, Lella Amos Martha, or Lella Amos Martha Fisher, or Lella Martha Kivinen.
- A-6919645, Klein, Doris Regine.
- A-7826036, Knittle, Viola.
- A-1212306, Koster, Stanislaw, or Stanley Koster, or Charles Koster.
- A-1534347, Lapatas, John or Lapas, or Ioannis Bassiliou Lapatas, or Bassili Lapatas, or John Bassiliou Lapatas.
- A-4810260, Lara-Heriberto, Enrique, or Enrique Heriberto Lara.
- A-3158305, Lawrence, Rheba Malinda (nee Lucas).
- A-6605462, Lee, Hwa-Ni, or Lawrence Hwa-Ni Lee.
- A-6704095, Lee, Lydia Shui-Yen (nee Shen).
- A-6142231, Leng, Shao Chuan.
- A-7092041, Lichtenstein, Peter Ladanyi, or Peter Ladanyi.
- A-6504787, Ling, Juliet Tchou.
- A-2997441, Ling, Choh Chun.
- A-7267779, Long, Patricia Hermine (nee Thomsett).
- A-1077226, Lopez, Jose Gudierrez, or Jose Curtiez or Gutierrez.
- A-5740455, MacMillan, John Francis.
- A-2660936, Malafouris, Charalambos, or Bob Malafouris.
- A-6803987, Mandel, Armand.
- A-6406978, Manganias, Christos N.
- A-7375504, Martens, Geraldine Gisela, or Gerhardine (Gerda) Gisela Kueffens.
- A-3482021, Martini, Nicholas.
- A-3482016, Martini, Catherine (nee Merle).
- A-7015094, Martini, Junior, Nicolas.
- A-7015095, Martini, Evelyn Helen.
- A-5165961, Mastrogeorgopoulos, Ioannis, or John Master.
- A-3598451, Mateus, Duarte.
- A-1684198, Matsui, Takejiro.
- A-4386046, McEachern, John Angus.
- A-6458422, McElligott, Justin William.
- A-6458421, McElligott, Ann Gabrielle.
- A-4076671, McGinnis, Ernest Livingston.
- A-7243285, Mei, Patsy, or Patsy Kong Mey.
- A-5564754, Meiras, Antonio, or Antonio Siso, or Antonio Micras Siso.
- A-2061604, Messados, Vassilios, or Vassilios Stamitiou Messados, or William Massas.
- A-1387508, Miller, Charles Herbert.
- A-7886273, Miller, Coral Elizabeth.
- A-5618461, Mitsopoulos, Nicolas, or Nick or Nicolaos Moustos.
- A-3802889, Mizen, Ernest Westwood.
- A-6063093, Monasterio, Arthur Gardner.
- A-4653393, Moreno, Marta Esperanza Ram-irez.
- A-1037812, Navarro, Diego Gallardo.
- A-3515640, Nom, Mon Ching, or Hing Mun, or Mun Hing.
- A-6374930, Novosad, Maria Aloisia, or Maria Louisa Novosad.
- A-3467666, Nozawa, Shichiroku.
- A-3710992, Ordenez, Raulfo Egar, or Raulfo Ordenez.
- A-6350831, Papamikos, Irene.
- A-7282694, Perandones, Pedro Pedrosa.
- A-7868302, Pereira, Nelson Santos.
- A-7264790, Perron, Magda Vincenzina, or Magda Vincenzina Bler.
- A-7948772, Peterson, Manfred, formerly Wegman.
- A-3363218, Pezzuti, Michele Angelo, or Mike Pasty, or Mike Pazi.
- A-4130486, Pitta, Rosalia Stanko, or Rose Pitta, formerly Rozalia Manusov Stanko, or Roca Nyari or Varga.
- A-4098715, Potter, Bertha (nee Zack).
- A-5549621, Puccio, Antonio or Anthony.
- A-5707372, Puccio, Salvatora, or Sally (nee Martini).
- A-2655837, Puckerin, Joseph Archibald.
- A-1122393, Radich, Vlaho, or Chaires Blaz Radich.
- A-7135349, Raiteri, Gina Domenica (nee Passerini).
- A-4176023, Redling, Joseph.
- A-7184730, Reiss, Hans.
- A-1475692, Resanovich, Adam.
- A-3947582, Ribas, Gumersindo Louis, or Gumersindo Louis Ribas Y Forto.
- A-5064504, Ribner, Sime or Rubner (nee Wojnelower).
- A-3566791, Ring, Sylvia (nee Gold).
- A-7092743, Rocca, Domenico Della.
- A-4847286, Rode, Konstantius Balthazar.
- A-5358463, Rosales-Benavides, Cipriano.
- A-7367118, Saccoccia, Nella (nee Nella DI Pillo).
- A-6435131, Santos, Benjamine (nee Gon-zales).
- A-4526743, Schafer, Doris June (nee Murray).
- A-6441475, Schamber, Selma, or Selma Strauss.
- A-1544255, Schwab, Lillian, or Lillian Ru-dolph (nee Lillian Goldman or Thelma Schwab or "Teddy").
- A-1471905, Scime, Raimonda (nee Scias-cia).

- A-2417573, Scinica, Fortunato, or Fortunato Sceneca.
 A-3090640, Scotto, Luigi.
 A-6403266, Seidita, Salvatore.
 A-3810778, Sen, Chu Do, or Do Sen Chu.
 A-4809716, Shapiro, Lillian (nee Meyer or Ravira or Raisel Meyer).
 A-7858555, Shipley, Emma, formerly Emma Fabrocini.
 A-3041755, Skaleris, Nick George, or Nick Kaleris.
 A-7222259, Simonds, Nivia Rosa Rivera Sandoval Rogers.
 A-3598150, Sjtoun, Harold, or Harold Sjtoun.
 A-3838291, Sliwa, Julia.
 A-4059205, Snarie, Mimah Alimah, or Mimah Aliman Curtiss, or Alimah Devi Mimah, or Alimah Devi, or Mimah Alimah.
 A-3022439, Sorrentino, Gennaro.
 A-7394621, Stephenson, Hubert, or Jubert Halston, or Ephraim Stephenson.
 A-6581940, Stewart, Zigrida Margareta, or Zigrida Margarete Stewart, or Zigrida Stewart, or Zigrida Margareta Graudins, or Zigrida Margareta Grosel.
 A-6884670, Stirling, Charles Nicholas.
 A-5444030, Stormer, Lillie (nee Robertson).
 A-6440949, Strohlic, Carol or Carl.
 A-6440948, Strohlic, Sabina (nee Bhoch or Bhock).
 A-7935398, Sweeting, Judy Deanne.
 A-4163209, Tanaka, Fumi Tatsuoaka Moriyama.
 A-4377561, Thomas, David Daniel.
 A-9747117, Titchen, John Alexander, or Alexander John Titchen, or Alexander J. Tichen, or John A. Titchen.
 A-4204187, Trafemchuk, Alexander.
 A-4797143, Tso, Shih, or Tso Shih, or Joseph Tso Shih.
 A-1479020, Vales, Harry Emanuel, or Charalamboa Varelakis, or Haraloabos Emanuel Varelakis.
 A-5032104, Varnes, Hedel Julia, or Hedel Julia Cott, or Jadwiga Stefanja Cotowna.
 A-3493647, Waltanen, Kosti Alexander, or Kosti Waltanen.
 A-6163778, Wang, Hsioh-Wu.
 A-2389787, Wilson, Arnold Usse, or Arnold Wilson.
 A-7177885, Wilson, Marianne Hedwig (nee Witte).
 A-7371751, Wirtz, Eckhard Johannes, or Eckhard Johannes Leja, or Eckhard Kytzia.
 A-1513918, Wojtkewicz, Julius, or Wojtkewicz or Julius Karski.
 A-7039520, Wong, Lorrie Tin Lock, or Tin Lock Wong.
 A-7243432, Yabe, Mitsuye, or Mary Mitsute Yabe, or Mitsuye Nishihama.
 A-6858242, Yang, Richard Fu-Sen.
 A-2866753, Yee, Wai Yum.
 A-7560751, Yee, Yoeh-Ming Ting (nee Ting).
 A-6972366, Yen, Hwang Han.
 A-2169996, Chan, Shuk Yee, or Shuk Yee Chan Hwang.
 A-1790238, Yoshihara Masako.
 A-1443370, Young, Frederick Nelson, or Frederick Gustav Jung.
 A-7463580, Zel, La Donnie, or Lo Donnie Zel.
 A-5216657, Alessi, Albino.
 A-4381732, Angelini, Ernesto Romeo.
 A-4190326, Angelino, Achille.
 A-4710375, Angelino, Mariantonia (nee Perrino or Maria Perrino Angelino or M. Antonia Angelino Perrino).
 A-2719067, Arriaga, Mario Rosario.
 A-4738613, Aslanoglu, Leonidas, alias Leo Siano, alias Leo Xeno Siano.
 A-5104423, Bauer, Joseph.
 A-4356772, Behar, Clara.
 A-4288750, Bercarich, Anthony or Antonio.
 A-4316950, Berger, Moris.
 A-3340793, Bew, Mon, or Yen Mon.
 A-1923586, Bojinoff, Paraskevia Batskova or Bonzoff, alias Bessie Bojinoff.
 A-1503041, Bratos, John, or John Vretos, or Jon Vretos, or Ioanis Bretos.
 A-7868369, Bryan, John Robeson.
 A-4576779, Bubuchi, Peter Constantino, or Evangelos Bubuchi, or Peter Constantino Spiros, or Peter Spiros.
 A-4737170, Camara, Francisco Tomas.
 A-4306180, Canali, Giovanni (John Canali).
 A-7385402, Candelaria, Paz.
 A-4868451, Car, Janko (John), or Steve Evaka, or Stefan Evaka, or Steve Evakoff, or Istvan Czur or Czarr or Carr or Zar.
 A-3312338, Cassiotis, Theodoros.
 A-5085705, Champendal, Ella Elisabetha.
 A-6163772, Chang, Jyh-Huei, or William Jyh-huei Chang.
 A-6392886, Chang, Ke-Ming.
 A-3086937, Chen, Sun, or Wing Sang.
 A-9574860, Choon, Lee Cho, or Lee Cho Chun, or Cho Choon, or Lee Choy Choon, or Lee Choon.
 A-4253431, Chow, Ng Goon, or Ng Ngoon Dew or Dau.
 A-3551013, Chun, Kam Yuen, or William Kan Yuen Chun.
 A-6732044, Cote, David Leon.
 A-3595935, Cretella, Baldassarre, or Benny Cretella.
 A-7550535, Crosbie, Grover Stanley, or Grover Crosbie.
 A-3660919, Culligan, Martha Barbara.
 A-1058805, D'Amico, Nicola Carmine.
 A-4348153, Dapontis, Ioannis, presently known as John Dapontis.
 A-6593620, Davis, Willemina.
 A-5251212, Dean, Fanny.
 A-7069478, DeBayser, Laurence Marie Jeanne.
 A-7071618, DeBayser, Catole.
 A-7064182, DeCaro, Francesco Paolo.
 A-7249017, Del Giudice, Maria Teresa (nee Viola or Teresa Viola), Teresa Del Giudice.
 A-2085630, DeLuevano, Gregoria Pedroza Vda, also Gregoria Pedroza.
 A-6233702, Di Giacomina, Luciano.
 A-6237313, Di Giacomina, Carmela.
 A-1356207, Din, Wahab.
 A-4307088, Doo, Jung Shu, or Jung Shee Tong, or Peter S. Jung.
 A-1619782, Doukas, Nicolaos, or Nicolaos John Doukas, or Nick Doukas.
 A-2658728, Eckert, John, or Janos Eckert.
 A-5450258, Edgar, John Nelson.
 A-7096916, Ennis, Emmy (Emmy Weyrich) (nee Kraemer).
 A-9787259, Enxuto, Carlos.
 A-3997988, Espinosa-Carrillo, Delfino, alias Dale Espinosa.
 A-1530949, Fat, Eng, or Henry Eng.
 A-4356656, Gaensslen, Paul August Otto.
 A-4917566, Garvey, Albert Victor.
 A-3324038, Garzia, Giovanni Omera.
 A-6362195, Gee, Joseph Doo-Keung.
 A-6171929, George, Emilia (nee Gouvou-sis).
 A-6088385, Giles, Mary Ann (nee Smith).
 A-6496388, Goldstein, Samuel.
 A-6472385, Goldstein, Taube (nee Frankfurter).
 A-5955757, Gonzales-Villicana, Miguel.
 A-1011226, Gosselin, Lorraine J., formerly Claudia Marie.
 A-7262019, Grassi, Maria Immacolata.
 A-7125377, Grego, Natalia Mastracchio.
 A-5025210, Grischuk, Walter Jacob.
 A-3663583, Guerrera, Donato.
 A-4497100, Guido, Thomas, or Tommasino Guido.
 A-4428935, Halasz, Gabriel or Gabor.
 A-4945626, Hamasaki, Haruji, or Haruzi Hamasaki, or Hitoshi Hamasaki, or Harry Hamasaki, or Harry Hama, or Harry Kasui Hamasaki.
 A-4565540, Hanella, Alfred, or Alfred Hamella.
 A-6639271, Harris, Caryl Anne.
 A-3158718, Hasson, Esther (nee Adeyah or Michela Rohas or Rojas).
 A-6323339, Hawtin, Edward Mervyn (Felt-ham) (Foster).
 A-3445319, Hider, Hussine Deeb, alias Harry Hider.
 A-3459540, Hider, Mohammed Deeb, or Mike Hider.
 A-1733400, Hietanen, Hilma, or Hilma Sundell (nee Juusenaho).
 A-2725986, Hirschal, Paula Anna.
 A-7769313, Hsu, En-Yun.
 A-6032936, Hsu, Tung-Kuei.
 A-6489134, Huber, Britta Sylvia Eleonoid.
 A-2763719, Ida, Isaku, or Toraichi Oishi.
 A-7360460, Iverson, Catherine Anne, or Catherine Anne Bond.
 A-6893630, Jimenez, Rudolfo, or Rudolph Gamble.
 A-3526330, Jones, Cuthbert McDonald.
 A-7274302, Kaan, Sze Kin.
 A-7274301, Kaan, Ann Chang.
 A-6343646, Kantzo, Efstratios.
 A-6343645, Kantzos, John.
 A-2403662, Katsiaris, Christos.
 A-4743298, Katz, Molly, or Mali Katz.
 A-7008891, Kinsey, Shirley Joanna.
 A-6371576, Kitcher, Janette Estelle.
 A-3374470, Kobzeff, John P., or Ivan P. Kobzeff.
 A-3374471, Kobzeff, Julia (nee Tickunoff).
 A-1355886, Kondrutzkov, Dimitri.
 A-1443419, Kondrutzkov, Daria (nee Petrova).
 A-5201518, Kotchos, Dimitrios Vasilou, or Jim Vasil Kotchoff.
 A-4990341, Krznovich, John.
 A-1116780, Kuintiene, Chana.
 A-2499249, Kumagai, Tomi (nee Tomi Yoshida).
 A-7246551, Kuo, Maying, or Ma Mu Yin Kuo.
 A-7246552, Kuo, Joseph Dennis, or Sun Yang Kuo, or Sing Yang Kuo.
 A-7246553, Kuo, Marie Esther, or Yen Shi Kuo.
 A-5219771, Lam, Shin Hing, or Lam Shin Hing.
 A-4674687, Lasuita, Michael.
 A-7079616, Lee, Milton Chun, or Milton C. Lee.
 A-7069322, Lee, Peng May Kau, or May Kau Feng.
 A-7069321, Lee, Milton Chun, Jr., or Milton Lee, Jr.
 A-7200791, Lee, Marion, or Mel Lan Lee.
 A-4125377, Lee, Samuel, or Lee Wing.
 A-7006439, Lee, Whamok Kim, or Wha Mok Kim, or Kim Wha Mok, or Whamok Kim, or Kim Whamoe.
 A-2557792, Lee, I. Kyung, or I Kyeng Lee, or Lee I. Kyung.
 A-5342497, Leguia, Victor Ernesto, or Victor Legua Camacho.
 A-2232168, Leibowitz, Mary (nee Pappelbaum).
 A-7385545, Lemmo, Antonio, or Anthony Lemmo.
 A-7600174, Lew, Grace Li-En, or Lew Li-En.
 A-7268435, Ling, Yee, or Ling Yee, or Charlie Yee.
 A-6699077, Linthicum, Elizabeth Jane Worsley, or Elizabeth Joyce Worsley Linthicum.
 A-1888029, Lisette, Dorothy Louise.
 A-4988427, Little, Winifred Maud (nee Smillie).
 A-6033423, Liu, James Che-Ming.
 A-7125315, Liu, Tsousue Kao.
 A-7457082, Liu, Lonnie.
 A-2749540, MacDonald, Dorothy Anna (nee Symes).
 A-4655168, Martinez, Francisco Zarate.
 A-3389010, Martinez, Sidronio, or Sidronio Martin, or Sidronio Gallardo Martin, or Sidronio G. Martinez Cifronio Martin.
 A-7178602, Marzahan, Hans-Ulrich.
 A-6836916, Mattson, Bo Olof, or Bo Olof Kauppi.
 A-3409854, McCullough, Edward Victor.
 A-5827389, McKendrick, Mary Barclay Strachan.
 A-4189822, Meha, Tuta.
 A-5638694, Mendes, John, or Tom Mendes.
 A-1319851, Mincheff, Petko Panayotoff, or George Petroff, or George Peters.
 A-4425319, Mizen, Amy Ruth, or Amy Ruth Warren.

A-4172428, Montecino, Antenor or Antonio.
 A-4318326, Romera, Vicenta Lorca.
 A-5578346, Montesinos, Concepcion Garcia.
 A-6630324, Montesinos, Vicenta.
 A-7032857, Montesinos, Manuel Fernandez.
 A-6633320, Montesinos, Conchita.
 A-5448363, Nakamura Fumiye, or Fumiye Uyeno.
 A-2388264, Nakagawa, John, or Sunkichi Nakagawa.
 A-7240047, Nichols, Frederick W., formerly Fritz Wolfgang Peterbauer.
 A-5942955, Ohab, Walter, or Wladyslaw Ohab, or Ladislaw Ohab.
 A-5441064, Oldakowska, Halina.
 A-3496978, Paetzold, Helene Henriette.
 A-5706590, Patterson, Alexandra Photos Leriou.
 A-9563511, Pavic, Valdimir.
 A-3915147, Pearman, Faith Mazie, or Faith Mazie Adams.
 A-1006704, Persi, Angelo.
 A-4387401, Peterson, Boris, or Boleslaw Treschinsky or Trescinski.
 A-7957311, Petrini, Stefano.
 A-3877925, Pinard, Alphonse Joseph.
 A-4727552, Pinto, Abilio Fernandes, or Abilio Pinto Fernandes.
 A-2495735, Podvinecz, Hermine, or Hermine Racz.
 A-7372124, Pompei, Pietro.
 A-7204914, Pozzi, Giovannina or Carusone.
 A-3764980, Provenghi, Bruno George.
 A-5047014, Provenghi, Enrica Bombardelli.
 A-7026553, Provenghi, Guido or John.
 A-7026387, Provenghi, Anita Costa.
 A-7026388, Provenghi, Carlos Bruno.
 A-6925878, Pullin, Patricia Anne.
 A-6033784, Quade, Lois Edna, or Bertha Edna Nicholas, or Mary Beatrice Nichols.
 A-4043273, Radke, Gustav Daniel.
 A-7019744, Radke, Russell Alvin.
 A-7019745, Radke, Stella Marie (now Hegsted).
 A-7020727, Radke, Elford Daniel.
 A-7375847, Ramil, Beatriz Betty.
 A-6810067, Reedy, Enrico Lucido.
 A-5099071, Reins, William Cornelius, or Cornelius William Reins, or William Reins.
 A-4596588, Reins, Salmi Adalfina (nee Davantli).
 A-7079633, Resch, Renate.
 A-7079634, Resch, Gerhard.
 A-3321611, Romagnolo, Vincenzo, or Vincent or "Jim" Romagnuolo.
 A-3105579, Romano, Silverio.
 A-6999695, Romero, Norma Borbolla.
 A-4294885, Rosenholm, Oscar, or Oscar Alecei (or Alacal or Alepei) Waldemar Rosenhold, alias Oscar Alecei Waldemar, alias George Lee.
 A-5217146, Sagara, Mie.
 A-4262120, Santos, Diosellina Quiroz-de los, alias Diosellina Marie Lopez-de los Santos.
 A-5467347, Schayek, Farha Sassoon.
 A-3440635, Schayek, Louise Sassoon.
 A-5312037, Scherlitz, William Albert, or Albert William Scherlitz.
 A-3213351, Serpi, Liugi.
 A-3784794, Shee, Yee (Yee Kwan Yee), or Mary Lee.
 A-7372138, Shew, Mah, or Harold Mah.
 A-6161419, Shibayama, Tatsue.
 A-6161420, Shibayama, Yuzo.
 A-7841053, Sodini, Cherubini Bertucelli.
 A-7841052, Sodini, Lorretta.
 A-7955505, Soullides, Demetrious Apostolou.
 A-6958019, Spafford, Lillian Mumford, or Lillian Mumford McDermott, or Liliyan McDermott, or Louise McGee.
 A-7112885, Spence, Ofelia Carmona, or Ofelia Valdes O'Farrill, or Ofelia Carmona O'Farrill.
 A-3868721, Stacy, Linda (nee Linda Eleanor Weaver), alias Linda Levensen, alias Linda Steiner.
 A-4855576, Stocklitsch, Hermine, or Hermine Stock.
 A-7416007, Straussman, Olga Schwartz.
 A-7416008, Straussman, Jean Claude.

A-7416009, Straussman, Lilliane.
 A-4864596, Tagliavia, Antonino, or Antonio Tagliavia, or Tony Poma.
 A-6982514, Tavoularides, Efstratis, or Efstratis Demetri Tavoularides, or Paul Costides, or Paul Georges.
 A-5162622, Tedford, George Edward.
 A-4958539, Tedford, Mary McSwinnery.
 A-7457228, Till, Margaret Maria Moberg Weber.
 A-7094105, Tischler, Salo.
 A-7037981, Tolton, Charles Gordon.
 A-3434944, Tonge, James Hezekiah.
 A-4641717, Valk, Evald Alexander Arthur, or Evald or Ewald Wack, or Edward Madison.
 A-7372105, Volker, Carmen Astrid.
 A-3049046, Walker, Arosemond, alias Arosemond or Rose Boyd.
 A-7419745, Weiss, Robert, or Robert Herdrick.
 A-5455131, Whelan, Florence, or Florence Lampert, or Florence Brett Ruth Whelan.
 A-7394768, Wyrick, Brunhilde Vicktoria, formerly Brunhilde Vicktoria Handl.
 A-3643395, Ying, Lee.
 A-3366268, Zampas, Eugene George.
 A-3955646, Zampas, Eugene, Jr.
 A-6006493, Zampas, Anna.
 A-1411892, Zorrilla, Eligio.
 A-7547137, Liu, Wen-Tsin.
 A-2070080, Lukats, Maria or Maria De Lukats.
 A-6330533, Sze, Nancy Wei-Fong Lee.
 A-6624909, Sze, Yi-Kwei.
 A-5890254, Wei, Tseh Heen.
 A-7547138, Wei, Saling Chung.
 A-7547136, Wei, Fong.
 A-7547144, Wei, Yulung or Jacqueline.
 A-7547139, Wei, Madeline or Yaling.
 A-4932112, Goldstein, Clara Pearl or Golden.
 A-4932272, Goldstein, Jack or Golden.
 V-1427412, Westra, Caroline Marietta.
 A-6293227, Partovi, Manuchehr or Manuchehr Manu Partovi.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6330838, Acevedo-Gamboa, Juan.
 A-7070049, Aguirre, Salvador, or Salvador Aguirre-Heredi.
 A-7070730, Aguirre, Eliseo.
 A-5669738, Aliprantis, Gerassimos Elias, or Jerry Elias Aliprantis.
 A-5898717, Aoki, Hisako, or Hisa Aoko.
 A-4564620, Baker, Fay, or Fay Bass or Falge Haas.
 A-6040312, Hass, Morris.
 A-5140696, Barata, Jose Antunes, or Joseph Antunes Barata.
 A-3933627, Barba, Jesus Munoz, alias Ewigdio Munoz Barba and Emilio Barba.
 A-7351287, Barry, Florence May Evelyn.
 A-1514930, Birle, Friedrich Karl, or Fritz or Fred Birle.
 A-6887046, Boyd, Blanche Theresa (nee Warmington).
 A-2846568, Burgess, Miriam Constance (nee Murphy).
 A-7122604, Camamis, Theodor.
 A-4800910, Candellini, Mario.
 A-5098486, Charous, Albin, or Albin Roebeling.

A-7297258, Chen, Bu Shing.
 A-6958543, Cheng, Shang-Wu.
 A-6848447, Cheng, Tsu-I Wang.
 A-3961645, Cheney, Jennie Bastina.
 A-2327066, Chiba, Akira.
 A-3629239, Chin-Tsuei, Lee, alias Anne Lee Young.
 A-3217461, Chiwaki, Ai (nee Tamura).
 A-6388596, Chung, Roberto Yi Tack.
 A-6849314, Cotte, Charles Marie Jean.
 A-7171732, Cotte, Marie Henriette, or Marie Louise Cotte (nee Charlemagne).
 A-5127606, Dalberg, Teobold Ludwig.
 A-6669920, Diamond, Bella (nee Greenberg), or Blanka Diakentsztejn.
 A-5273768, DiMatteo, Francisco, alias Frank DiMatteo Frank Calligaree.
 A-5363172, Duran, Consuelo.
 A-5004726, Elfe, Frederick.
 A-7371791, Elefmann, Hartmut.
 A-6839917, Faustino, Fae Judith.
 A-6839918, Faustino, Daniel.
 A-1000241, Fischer, George Richard, or George Milong.
 A-7361933, Fischl, Bertl David, or David Bertl Fischl or Bertl David.
 A-4939160, Flood, Thomas James.
 A-7179926, Fodo, Andrew.
 A-6910444, Fogel, Isaac.
 A-7415215, Foitlyn, Renata (nee Leblova).
 A-7419832, Fu, An, or Fu An or Fu Au.
 A-7399566, Fu, Siu-Lian Chen.
 A-7419811, Fu, Hua Priscilla.
 A-4011479, Fung, Ping Kan.
 A-7270824, Giotis, Niki C., or Niki Petros Apostolidou.
 A-6292008, Gosling, Judith Pamela, or Judith Pamela Murdock.
 A-6292009, Gosling, Linda Margaret, or Linda Margaret Murdock.
 A-2144764, Gunnarson, Gustave Adolf Velfrid, or Gus Gunnarson.
 A-5409334, Haack, Jeinrich Johann, alias Henry Haack.
 A-6400116, Hadidian, Dikran Yenovk.
 A-5978530, Hadlund, Peter Larson or Peter Larson or Peter Larson Nedlund.
 A-7152778, Haire, Carmen Judy (nee Carmen Judy Furnari).
 A-7026369, Hamano, Tadashi.
 A-4855815, Hamano, Kamejiro.
 A-4855836, Hamano, Shizuko.
 A-5924057, Harris, Johnnie, or John Harris or Charlie or Jolly Robinson.
 A-7424123, Harrison, Katherine Christina, formerly Pirkko Helena Piiparinen.
 A-3767849, Higuchi, Hatsuno.
 A-5465265, Hinsch, Dorothea Frieda (nee Lindborst).
 A-7809492, Hulsenbusch, Hansi Curt.
 A-7809493, Hulsenbusch, Mario Detlef.
 A-7809491, Hulsenbusch, Evelyn Margaret.
 A-5313389, Hsi-Tseng, Wen, or Wen Shi Tseng.
 A-7390943, Illinger, Karl Heinz.
 A-2443853, Ishikawa, Toshitaro.
 A-2946491, Ishikawa, Komano Orta.
 A-4094816, Jackson, Jerry Francis.
 A-2319648, Jennings, Grace Mildred Violet (nee Whate), or Grace Mildred Scott.
 A-4559276, Jensen, Aksel Elon.
 A-1811886, Judith, Avram Misa, or Ayram M. Judith or Avrah Judith.
 A-5436861, Kanakakis, Antonios Steve, or Anthony Kanakakis.
 A-3017281, Kanapka, George.
 A-6921706, Kanderis, Evangelos, or Angelos Kanderis.
 A-1262169, Karagianis, Matheos S.
 A-3356210, Kawaguchi, Raizo.
 A-1651081, Kefalas, Spyridon Charanambos, or Spiros Charanambos Kefalas or Spiros Harry Kefalas.
 A-5661155, Kent, Walter Kee, or Bing Kee Kent or Kan Kee.
 A-6725862, Kondratenko, Nikolai, or Nicholas Kondratenko or Nicholas De Witt.
 A-4398788, Kubota, Gogi, or George Kobe, or George Kubota or Kenzo Kubota.
 A-3730612, Laaksonen, Alina Pauline, or Alina Pauline or Senni Rautanen.

- A-7045504, Lai, Daniel, or Lai Dou Yen or Lai Dou-Can.
 A-7248054, Lau, Monique Marguerite (nee Cherpitel).
 A-6261598, Lazarou, Christina (nee Hagstillaadou).
 A-6841244, Lee, Song Kwan, or Paul Lee Molina.
 A-3466717, Lee, Young Soon, or Choi Yong Soon.
 A-7363010, Ledee, Joseph Gilbert.
 A-7975408, Lefevre, Claude Shu.
 A-7975410, Lefevre, Cecilia Sophie.
 A-1865838, Li, Lien Yen.
 A-5147578, Lightenstein, Ida (nee Zangwill).
 A-658927, Ling, Frank Yu-Suan, alias Yu-Shan Ling.
 A-6437087, Llinares, Juan Salleras.
 A-7247981, Lum, Yuk Wah, or Jenny Lum (nee Yuk Wah Noy).
 A-7392099, Mack, Marion Ione or Ione (nee Christian or Smith).
 A-5466819, Madokoro, Sannosuke.
 A-7392826, Madonna, Carla (nee Paganelli).
 A-3961538, Marcy, Grace Bethune (nee Grace Elwayne Bethune).
 A-4921405, Mattes, Stergios Christ.
 A-3803729, Milanese, Giacomo.
 A-3263640, Milgrom, Bella.
 A-1650278, Miura, Koshiro.
 A-1650279, Miura, Haruko, or Haruko Masuda (MN).
 A-6335361, Moayeri, Nilfar.
 A-2152035, Mohammed, Saleh Ali, or Salih Ali or Sahil Ali or Saleh Ali.
 A-7540739, Morel, Andree, or Andree Justine Morel.
 A-5833521, Morin, Ernest.
 A-3050745, Moulis, Steve, or Efstathios Moulis.
 A-7397883, Muehlberger, Heinrich Peter, or Heinrich Peter Jud.
 A-7427806, Mullikin, Peggy Ruth, formerly Princess Peggy Macedowski.
 A-7118804, Musallam, Sami Nimer (Dr.).
 A-5394629, Nishikawa, Takeshi, or Philip Nishikawa.
 A-6840225, Ortega y Barrera, Nieves, or Nieves Soto y Ortega.
 A-4608753, Oshita, Shigematsu, or Naozo Mukai.
 A-4608755, Oshita, Rikiye, or Kiyono Mukai.
 A-7646867, Parker, Johanna Shizu Nari-shima.
 A-4472505, Pagano, Giuseppe, or Joseph Pagano.
 A-6054277, Penn, Gloria Ludena.
 A-7778976, Penn, Reuben Alfredo.
 A-7978975, Penn, Dorriel.
 A-5612932, Perez, Jose, or Jose Perez Rodriguez or Jose Perez Seoane.
 A-7450566, Perez, Antonio Nelson, or Antonio Nelson Perez y Soto.
 A-6357861, Perkins, Julia Maria Kim, alias Julia Maria Han or Julia Maria Han y Kim, or Mrs. Harry Kim Perkins.
 A-7240127, Pieczynski, Therese Josephine, formerly Therese Josephine Vanden Abeele or Therese Josephine Vaden.
 A-7394770, Pietro, Rita (nee Bartollino).
 A-4571123, Pinkovsky, John, or John Robert Shuka.
 A-2631467, Pires, Ignacio.
 A-9688319, Pither, Reginald Leonard.
 A-6970339, Paju, Maryvonne, alias Maryvonne Marthe Toussina Larcher.
 A-6970340, Paju, Marianne, alias Marianne Louise Neele Larcher.
 A-9794365, Poupalos, Manolis Constantine, or Manolis Poupalos.
 A-1122251, Pujol, Pedro Sellares, alias Pablo Salas.
 A-2056077, Putala, Veronica, or Sister Mary Gisella.
 A-6635466, Reyes y Navarro, Simon.
 A-5422921, Ritter, Huldreich, or Charles Ritter.
 A-3995038, Roberts, Ada Jessie.
 A-6310149, Robbins, Rose.
 A-4062904, Robinson, Jack, or Joaquin Antonio Rodriguez or Joachim Rodriguez.
 A-5172002, Robson, Hilda Arias, or Hilda Tyndall or Hilda Munoz Arias or Hilda Arias Torry or Hilda Socorro Arias or Hilda Arias Tyndall Torry.
 A-6377064, Rocos, George Constantine, or George C. Bocos.
 A-6377037, Rocos, Grammatiki Ioannou, or Grammatiki (Kiki) Rocos or Niki Grammatiki Rocos or Riki Rocos or Kiki Grammatiki Ioannou or Grammatiki (Kiki) Ioannou or Kiki Ioannou.
 A-7361475, Rogers, Gabriel Frank, or Gaber Ferenc Jausz.
 A-2357775, Rose, Stanley John.
 A-1074016, Roussell, Marcel Gaston, or George Kinelle or George Kinelli.
 A-9631664, Salvador, Rafael.
 A-6704923, Samppala, Lehja Marjatta (nee Nenonen), alias Marietta Samppala.
 A-6082604, Saunders, Dudley Livingston, or Dudley Saunders or Dudley Saunders or Robert James Day.
 A-4942528, Scheibner, Albert Kurt, or Albert Kurt Scheible.
 A-3651799, Schuller, Katharina, or Katharine Baume.
 A-5300176, Schwarzer, Stephenie Eva, or Stephenie Eva Murphy (nee Daunis).
 A-5362775, Scotti, Pasquale Scotti, or Patsy Scotti.
 A-1462488, Sideris, Nicholas Aristides, alias Nick Sideris.
 A-2963769, Siordia-Languren, Fernando, or Fernando Langurel Siordia.
 A-5912083, Smith, Edward Joseph.
 A-6263657, Smith, Raphaela Albertha, or Raphaela Albertha Roumow.
 A-4895918, Singh, Bisham, or Sucha Singh or Bishha Singhy or Sunday Singh.
 A-4185278, Solis, Guillermina Febles.
 A-1718074, Soto, Jose Migueles, or Jose Soto.
 A-5212079, Stathos, Koula Vasiliki (nee Vouliodou).
 A-4809160, Stenesto, Martin Nicolaus, or Martin Nilsen or Maurice Nelson or Martin Nicolaus Nelsen Stenesto or Martin Nielsen.
 A-6840090, Stephenson, Patrick John.
 A-7112539, Stewart, Vincent.
 A-1235075, Strougo, Victor, or Raymond Andre Lopez y Ateca or Artegas.
 A-7375959, Suemming, Bodo, or Bodo Fritz Kurt Suemning.
 A-3284493, Sungy, Helen Jeanette, or Helen Jeanette Logas.
 A-2252832, Suzuki, Ichiro.
 A-5972594, Tores, Milan Teodor, or Emile M. Tores.
 A-3479084, Tavares, Ludgero, alias Luther Tavares.
 A-7423302, Thigpen, Jessie Benjamin.
 A-6836237, Thomas, Arthur Livermoor.
 A-4931820, Ting, Anthony Un-Noeh.
 A-4941257, Torres, Frances, or Frances Aguilar or Frances Ruerta.
 A-5634703, Torres de Arredondo, Trinidad.
 A-7050974, Trillo, Antonio, or Antonio Trillo Ordenez.
 A-7050973, Trillo, Matilde.
 A-7283636, Tuzon, Ernesto.
 A-2022521, Tye, Soo Cheong.
 A-2942693, Vamasescu, Nicolas.
 A-2942694, Vamasescu, Despina Igorosanu, or Pal Icy.
 A-7287089, Veloz-Cuevas, Tomas.
 A-3392392, Weibel, Anna.
 A-5253477, Weissberg, Otto, alias Otto Whitehill.
 A-4892331, Whitlow, John William, or Jack Whitlow.
 A-2626095, Wilson, Marguerite M. (nee Landry), formerly Boggs.
 A-7011658, Won, Eng Seow, or Yvonne Eng.
 A-9579093, Wooster, Walter William, or Chang Kum Sul.
 A-4344406, Wuertle, Otto.
 A-5363224, Yamaguchi, Hide, or Hide Tokunaga.
 A-4391435, Ying, Chang Mo or Chang, or Bobby.
 A-4069003, Yoshimura, Shinichi, or Henry Yoshimura.
 A-7457347, Young, Beatrice Raymonde.
 A-2583858, Ysidro, Montoya-Salazar.
 A-6268799, Yuen, Lee Shau, or Lee Sing Pik.
 A-6313255, Yuen, Louise Lore.
 A-2075484, Zipper, Fannie, or Florence Gardner.
 A-7203901, Zuentenstein, Alfred.
 A-3504425, Akasaki, Yoshio, or Yoshito Akasaki.
 A-3099496, Akasaki, Isoko, or Isoko Ishimuro.
 A-4732801, Akiyama, Shizuko (nee Shizuko Tada).
 A-3282640, Akume, Hanori, or Roy Akume.
 A-3900724, Alleyne, Rosa Ambrosine, alias Rose Ambrozane Alleyne.
 A-5537133, Angelini, Guido, or Guido Biascovich.
 A-4931914, Arata, Carlo Angelo, or Carlo Arata or Carlo Lodi.
 A-1205335, Arehart, Fernanda Maria (nee Peverini).
 A-7247946, Aversa, Rosaria Marrone.
 A-5651299, Avina, Antonio, Andrade.
 A-7457937, Baeshore, Karin Franziska.
 A-7197107, Baker, Hasmig Ruth (nee Kul-edjian), alias Haanik Kesmezkilic.
 A-6363434, Ball, Cyril Thomas.
 A-6363435, Ball, Alwen Elizabeth.
 A-7539287, Barton, George Donald.
 A-5388747, Becht, Margaret Ellen (nee Methot).
 A-4664561, Berlich, Peter, or Petar Brcic.
 A-7094381, Berger, Karin Hildegard.
 A-7371685, Blessas, Robert, or Robert Massimo Blessas or Massimo Robert Blessas formerly Robert Massimo Vallone.
 A-6461098, Blumberg, Leib.
 A-1005545, Bonifer, Loretta Annie (nee White (or LeBlanc)), or Loretta Annie Wells.
 A-2585740, Boyajian, Mariam, or Mary or Mariam Manogian or Mariam Ambojian.
 A-6986704, Bramble, Yvonne Mak Ching (nee Foo).
 A-7203650, Brand, Shimon, or Simon Brand.
 A-5948261, Brathwaite, Charles Christopher.
 A-9671236, Bresler, Petrus Hermanus.
 A-6453789, Broacha, Firoze Hormusji.
 A-6740253, Bronstein, Menachem or Melvin.
 A-6887700, Bronstein, Estera or Esther (nee Duybner).
 A-7222003, Brylkin, Ariadne.
 A-1141021, Cantatore, Mauro, or Maurice Cantatore.
 A-71122688, Castro-Castro, Moises.
 A-5067641, Catalano, Agatino.
 A-6026529, Chang, Peh-I.
 A-2174443, Chavez-Soto, Felipe.
 A-4940843, Cheung, Goon Man, or David Jung or David Yuen.
 A-2460182, Chung, Celia Tam (Tam Jung Wan).
 A-7011010, Chung, Julia.
 A-7011008, Chung, Jennie.
 A-7011009, Chung, Mamie.
 A-4442569, Comeau, James Percy.
 A-4891359, Costanzo, Gregorio Pietro.
 A-7394509, Craun, Gunther Franz, or Gunther Franz Mages.
 A-2600753, Cubas, Ferdinand, alias Ferdie Cubas.
 A-3958279, Curry, Madlyn Hope.
 A-6004158, Daniels, Rose.
 A-6643125, Davila-Davila, Francisco Jesus.
 A-4248186, DeFauw, Yvonne.
 A-5265622, DeFernandez, Eulalia Barron (nee Eulalia Barron).
 A-7037822, Fernandez-Barron, Luis.
 A-7420861, Deike, Eileen Bostwick.
 A-4861423, De La Bat, Bernade Jan Gerard.
 A-5641047, DeLara, Carmen Davila, alias Carmen Bieggar alias Carmen Devila Alvarez.
 A-4913533, DeLopez, Rafaela Luevano, or Rafaela Luevano.
 A-3778612, DeLopez, Soledad Maria de los Santos, alias Soledad Maria de los Santos de Quiroz.
 A-7266087, DeLuna, Ursula Martinez.

- A-4162187, Demers, Josephine Mary (nee Josephine Mary Gagnow).
 A-7356333, DeMeyer, Joseph Joannes.
 A-7421594, DeMeyer, Jacqueline Marguerite.
 A-7421595, DeMeyer, Simonne Elagie.
 A-6062958, Doane, Evalyn Victoria (nee Clarke).
 A-9736923, DosSantos, Americo Rodrigues.
 A-4694706, Dick, May Belle, or Christine May Belle Dick (nee Hamilton).
 A-7099288, Doetsch, Karl Maximilian.
 A-7083776, Drieling, Leendert.
 A-7070170, Duran, Jesus Rafael Liron, or Rafael Liron or Rafael Liron-Duran.
 A-7079650, Durando, Gerard Victor.
 A-7354173, Emmel, Evelyn Cornelia.
 A-7050949, Esqueda, Maria Teresa.
 A-7050948, Esqueda, Donaciano.
 A-7387447, Evers, Arnold Stanley.
 A-5390997, Febles, Silviana Francesca.
 A-5833478, Folsom, Ellen Rose.
 A-6014862, Fraser, Esme Iola or "Greaves" or "Viola."
 A-2359744, Friedman, Harry Raphael, or Freeman.
 A-1148404, Fris, Josefín, or Jospa Frisch.
 A-2744898, Gallo-Ruiz, Eliliano, or Eliliano Gallo.
 A-1452184, Galloto, Gaetano.
 A-4475577, Georges, Ainsworth Bunting, or Louis J. Brown.
 A-7203245, Gillbreath, Vera Agnes, or Vera Agnes Allen or Vera Agnes Doane.
 A-1704613, Goldstein, Rose.
 A-7427541, Goltzman, Salomon, or Salomon Goltman.
 A-7445236, Gonzalez, Jose B.
 A-4022837, Gonzalez-Carranza, Simon.
 A-7049673, Gomez, Jose Guadalupe.
 A-7049672, Gomez, Miguel.
 A-7180855, Gonzalez-Renteria, Raul.
 A-6603154, Gonzalez y Reyes, Angel, or Angel Gonzalez.
 A-4999747, Gonzalez-Zepeda, Fortino.
 A-4035970, Goodhart, John, alias John Goodhart.
 A-4338838, Grauman, Regina, or Krojna Rywka Groman or Kreine Rivk Graoman or Kreine Rivka Jannof.
 A-1229899, Grieve, John Davidson, or Jack Grieve.
 A-4742456, Grinberg, Herman Karl.
 A-3262533, Hal, Jung Won, or Mrs. Wong On.
 A-7186411, Haight, Elleen Annie (nee Clancy).
 A-3636876, Hamblen, Irene Isabelle, alias Irene Isabelle Boon.
 A-6887941, Hamblyn, Jewell Violet Pearl.
 A-3154461, Helgeson, Henry, or Henry Helgeson.
 A-5328574, Henry, Lillian Gladys (nee Antill).
 A-4506192, Hernandez, Mariano, or Mario Hernandez.
 A-1512737, Hazeltine, Helen Hilda, or Helen Hilda Roux or Helen Hilda Thorogood.
 A-2999950, Hiraoka, Tadaichi, or George Hiraoka or George Yoshimoto or Seigaku Yoshimoto.
 A-7469546, Hodge, Enid Iova, or Enid Iova Thomas.
 A-6847772, Hu, Hung Yuan.
 A-7056883, Jansen, Avran, alias Avram Gansen.
 A-1048853, Jusup, Kadir Bin, or Kader Jusup.
 A-7354074, Jimenez, Arsenio Teodoro.
 A-7274105, Johnson, Rosario Serra, or Rosario G. Serra or Rosario Serra Gavito.
 A-4720874, Johnson-Martinez, Bernabe.
 A-6732408, Kalman, Ferenc.
 A-4902559, Kaptain, Violet, formerly Suffolk (nee Coleman).
 A-7197992, Kazarlan, Shavarah.
 A-7037455, Kennicutt, Ruth Jeanette Kenny, alias Ruth Jeanette Kenny, alias Jeanne (Jannette) (Ruth) Kenny, alias Janie Louise Jette, alias Louise Jette, or Ruth Malloy.
 A-7276640, Kolb, Ida Crescencia, or Ida Crescencia Hatz or Ida Crescencia Rogner.
 A-6680598, Kontarakis, Helen, or Helene S. Countorakis.
 A-7244992, Korey, Dorothy (nee Delih Badou Sand).
 A-2924446, Knickle, Goldie Evelyn (nee Mason).
 A-8001048, Ladan, Samuel, or Samuel Ladan Vinju.
 A-2515839, Landeta, Jose (Jose Landeta), or Jose Domingo Landeta.
 A-6059440, Lee, Karl C., alias Ki-Cheng Lee.
 A-5098788, Livingston, Florence Elizabeth, formerly Florence McLean or Florence Schmidt (nee Florence Allen).
 A-7049121, Loizides, Soumela (nee Anastasiadis), or Sourela Panagiotou Anastasiadou.
 A-5276973, Machida, Masaru Michael.
 A-6920375, Maillett, Marie Louise (nee Frontain), formerly Dougette.
 A-6881284, Mancusi, Albert.
 A-3909619, Mark, Gock Lum, or Mark Lum, or Gock L. Mark.
 A-7178884, Marmolejo, Guadalupe.
 A-7274221, Marquez, Pedro.
 A-7550734, McCarthy, Terence Michael.
 A-7023632, McNevin, Harry Angus.
 A-6859638, Mendelowitz, Charlotte.
 A-6556882, Mendelowitz, Fani (nee Davidovics).
 A-6859052, Mendelowitz, Betty.
 A-6556883, Singer, Flora (nee Mendelowitz).
 A-4790454, Mocellin, Giovanni Battista, or John B. Mocellin.
 A-3078904, Montes de Villalva, Carmen.
 A-6767320, Mosiewicz, Zimel, or Zimel Masowicke.
 A-5406058, Munoz y Sotomayor, Benjamin, or Benjamin Munoz.
 A-7363000, Nesrallah, Abdou, or Abdu Messralla.
 A-1124376, Nicolich, Giuseppe, or Antonio Nicolich.
 A-4152724, Oishi, Satoshi.
 A-7020487, Oishi, Yei, or Ei Oishi.
 A-2742641, Ong, Helen, or Lim Tan Shing.
 A-2381190, Oropesa-Herrera or Sister Rita Oropesa or Sister Rita del Immaculada Corazon de Maria Oropesa.
 A-7280044, Orphanos, Anastacia.
 A-775920, Pasaidis, Fedon Hristodulos, or Don Pasaidis or Fedon Pasaidis.
 A-3622420, Peeke, Wallace Frank, or Frank Wallace Smith or Frank Wallace Peeke.
 A-6743196, Percy, Julie Anne, or Julie Anne Riley.
 A-7358577, Petronio, Vivitta Giovanna.
 A-7358563, Petroni, Luigi, or Louis Petronio.
 A-7358578, Petronio, Carlo Federico.
 A-5201260, Pezella, Rafaele, or Ralph Pezella alias Domenico Mugnano.
 A-2207816, Pichot, Marcel Pierre Jean-Maria.
 A-7681487, Polychroniadis, Lazaros Serafim.
 A-3273809, Poulymenos, Eleftherios K., or Theodor Coroukly.
 A-6965318, Prevost, Edmond Vallone, or Edmond Prevost.
 A-6394556, Przewozman, Abraham.
 A-2569854, Quirke, Anna Margaret, or Annie Margaret Quirke.
 A-7264310, Quon Jeung Wing, or Wong Jeung Wing Quon.
 A-7280071, Rahm, Helga.
 A-7280072, Rahm, Ernest.
 A-7365496, Raschle, Rudolph Richard.
 A-6159552, Remenyi, Janos, or John Remenyi.
 A-5662563, Riley, Florence Francis (nee Ryan).
 A-7083553, Rios, Estanislao, or Estanislado Rios or Estanislao Rios-Cervantes.
 A-7083554, Rios, Rito.
 A-7130250, Rios, Rosallo, or Rosallo Rios-Lozano.
 A-5596513, Robb, William Glen.
 A-5450855, Robles-Mendez, Alberto.
 A-7140461, Roman-Yerena, Antonio.
 A-7140465, Roman-Salinas, Enrique.
 A-7140466, Roman-Salinas, Rafael.
 A-6931254, Said, Hylda Kathleen (nee Allison).
 A-5223429, Sanchez, Emilio Hermida, or Emilio Hermida.
 A-3778615, Santos, Adolfo Quiros-de los, alias Adolph Santos Lopez.
 A-3677416, Sasajima, Jiso, or Henry Jiso Sasajima.
 A-1439133, Sanduski, Anastasia Serheenko, or Anastasia Sergeenko.
 A-2790568, Santo, Marcel Marrugat, or Marcel Maraugat.
 A-2328059, Scheibling, Joseph.
 A-7209608, Schmidt, Hede Erika.
 A-5830296, Shields, Ellen.
 A-4352885, Sjöberg, Victor Sigfrid.
 A-7387476, Small, Eva, alias Eva Goldine or Eva Goodman.
 A-5925127, Smith, Albert Auston, or Bert Smith.
 A-6539202, Smith, Mary, or Mary Guerrero (nee Mary Cockhoff).
 A-7022573, Soenarie, Devi Soetinah, or Devi Tinan or Cecilia.
 A-9777435, Soenarie, Peter, alias Eddie Linau.
 A-3079320, Soler-Carvajal, Antonio, or Antonio Soler or Escanvajal.
 A-3409677, Soloria-Chavez, Bonifacio.
 A-1579036, Sommer, Hans Max.
 A-7510754, Spartaly, John, or John Charles Spartaly.
 A-5668955, Steinhart, William Edward, or William Edward Hart.
 A-7418258, Steinnagel, Marion Elene.
 A-7415850, Stone, Barbara Alexandria, or Barbara Fink Stone or Barbara Alexandria Cottschalk.
 A-4868555, Summers, Azalla Lydia, or Lydia Summers (nee Wilkins).
 A-3456536, Sun, David Cheng-Chin.
 A-4203061, Sun, Yuan Mei S.
 A-7203116, Sweeting, Viola, or Annie Sweeting.
 A-3201677, Symynuk, William, or William Samson.
 A-4768752, Tamm, Johannes, or John Tamm.
 A-3216884, Tamotsu, Tokio, or Tokio Sumi, or Jackie T. Tamotsu.
 A-4775443, Terceno, Joaquin Paul, or Joaquin Terceno, or Joaquin Pablo Terceno.
 A-1315498, Thwaites, Joseph William.
 A-7026382, Tinajero-Martinez, Sergio Flavio, or Sergio Tinajero.
 A-7092856, Torres-Pena, Raul, or Raul Torres.
 A-7118444, Toro-Balderas, Joel Del.
 A-7118445, Toro-Balderas, Maria Isabel Del.
 A-7280006, Ullrich, Helga, or Helga O'Brien, or Helga Josephine Smrcka.
 A-7065632, Urban, Chon King.
 A-1008912, Vasquez, Guadalupe, or Guadalupe Gonzalez.
 A-2353005, Vennola, Einick William, or Elno William Vennola.
 A-7463077, Verley, Allan.
 A-4540341, Vidor, Laszlo, or Ladislaus Vidor, or Leslie Vidor.
 A-2507036, Villafana-Gambino, Vicente.
 A-7178315, Villescas, Ignacia.
 A-7203023, Watson, William.
 A-5448561, Weitz, Zygmund, or Zygmunt Weitz, alias Sigmund Wites.
 A-7222488, Wharton, Margaret Madonna.
 A-4795107, Williams, Clara Muriel (nee Hall).
 A-7036941, Winge, Claude Patrick, or Klaus Helm.
 A-1437824, Winter, Richard.
 A-7248004, Wolf, Ellen Dora Johanna (nee Schacht).
 A-7365177, Woo, How Ah, or Ah Hou Wu.
 A-6057673, Woods, Diana.
 A-4769465, Woods, Carlo Emanuel.
 A-4937011, Young, Dorothy Lillian, or Dorothy Lillian Mizen.
 A-5040480, Zissis, Constantinos Tryfon, or Constanti T. Zissis.
 A-2752654, Gounaris, Spiros Demetrios, or Spiridos Goumanis.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 24, after line 14, add the following registration numbers and names:

"A-5780358, Dhoot, Bishan Singh.
"A-5899216, Hall Gwendolyn Elizabeth."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

FRANK C. TORTI

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 559) for the relief of Frank C. Torti. There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2603) entitled "A bill for the relief of Frank C. Torti" now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

The resolution was agreed to.

GAY STREET CORP., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 566) for the relief of the Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2779) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Gay Street Corp. of Baltimore, Md.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

SARAH A. DAVIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 975) for the relief of Sarah A. Davies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sarah A. Davies, of Great Barrington, Mass., the sum of \$17,840, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses heretofore sustained, or which may hereafter be sustained, by the said Sarah A. Davies, on account of damages heretofore caused, or which may hereafter be caused to her fox farm, located at Great Barrington, Mass., by military, naval, and Air Force activity in that area: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this

act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "military, naval, and Air Force activity" and insert "activities of the Armed Forces of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COBB NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1099) for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the executor of the estate of Cobb Nichols, deceased, late of Jackson, Ala., the sum of \$308.37. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said estate against the United States for damage which resulted when the Corps of Engineers, in constructing a cut-off canal at Sunflower Bend, Tombigbee River, Ala., during the period beginning November 9, 1937, and ending March 29, 1938, destroyed the means of land ingress and egress to certain property belonging to the said Cobb Nichols: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$308.37" and insert "\$175."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELLIS E. GABBERT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1826) for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$435.12 to Ellis E. Gabbert, of Port Angeles, Wash., in full settlement of all

claims against the United States as reimbursement for expenses in moving household goods from Spokane, Wash., to Port Angeles, Wash., during the month of January 1950, while employed by the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$435.12" and insert "\$438.87."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLOMAN INSTRUMENT CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of the Kloman Instrument Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the Kloman Instrument Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., the sum of \$1,635.19. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Kloman Instrument Co., Inc., against the United States and the District of Columbia for payment for medical supplies and services furnished (under emergency conditions) to Gallinger Municipal Hospital during the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948, for which no payment can be made under existing laws although such supplies and services were received and accepted in good faith: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "United States and the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD S. LAWSON ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2789) for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard S. Lawson, his wife, Winifred G. Lawson; Walter P. Lawson, and his wife, Nita R. Lawson, of Dillon Beach, county of Marin, State of California, the sum of \$11,203, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Howard S. Lawson; his wife, Winifred G. Lawson; Walter P. Lawson; and his wife, Nita R. Lawson; as a result of damage to grounds, buildings, and equipment on the 5 acres, more or less, at Dillon Beach, County of Marin, State of California, leased to War Department under lease numbered 868-Engineers-2136 dated December 10, 1941, and used for shelter and other purposes by detachments of the Seventeenth Infantry, National Guard Service, the Seventh Army Corps and other Army units, and the Coast Guard, from December 10, 1941, to February 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$11,203" and insert "\$7,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS E. BELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2902) for the relief of Thomas E. Bell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Thomas E. Bell, Lincoln Park, Mich., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$609.70 heretofore paid to him as active-service pay for the period beginning October 12, 1946, and ending December 31, 1946, during which he was serving on active duty as a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps Reserve. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for all payments made to the said Thomas E. Bell as active-service pay for the period beginning October 12, 1946, and ending December 31, 1946.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Thomas E. Bell, Lincoln Park, Mich., the sum of \$140. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Thomas E. Bell against the United States for compensation and allowances due him as a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps Reserve for the period beginning January 1, 1947, and ending January 19, 1947.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

XCVIII—207

ROBERT A. BUCHANAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4455) for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to reinstate the policies N-8383625 and V-3271571, issued to Robert A. Buchanan, of Linden, N. J. Such renewal being made upon the payment of all premiums required by the Administrator.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "N-8383625" and insert "N-8683625."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD J. VOLTIN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4932) for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and wife, Tecla Voltin, and daughters, Mrs. Paula J. Voltin Sansom and Jacqueline Voltin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward J. Voltin and wife, Tecla Voltin, and daughters, Mrs. Paula J. Voltin Sansom and Jacqueline Voltin, of San Antonio, Tex., the sum of \$5,980.85. Such sum represents property damage sustained by the said Edward J. and Tecla Voltin, Paula J. Voltin Sansom, and Jacqueline Voltin as the result of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane on Quincy Street, San Antonio, Tex., on July 11, 1948, such plane operated by a member of the United States Air Force. The claim of the said Edward J. and Tecla Voltin, Paula J. Voltin Sansom, and Jacqueline Voltin is not a claim which is cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "Voltin," strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "the sum of \$4,784.14; to pay L. F. Osterberg the sum of \$842.46; to pay Mrs. Carolyn H. King the sum of \$22,605.94; to pay Carol King the sum of \$2,335.08; to pay Dr. R. L. and Claudia Jacobs the sum of \$14,208.76; to pay Mrs. Annie T. Halle and Mrs. Evelyn Peyton the sum of \$18,810.28; to pay Mrs. Ruth M. Auth the sum of \$452.64; to pay Mrs. Richard L. Grayless the sum of \$665.22; to pay Mrs. Emma Geneva Burke the sum of \$549.34; to pay Mrs. Rosina Fowler the sum of \$2,144.79; to pay Mrs. Mary E. and her son Sidney J. Blair the sum of \$352.30; to pay Mrs. Beulah C. King the sum of \$7,005.82; and to pay Mrs. Marie J. Pelt the sum of \$2,113.10, all of San Antonio, Tex. Such sums represent property damage sustained by these claimants as a result of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane on Quincy Street, San Antonio, Tex., on July 11, 1948, such plane operated by a member of the United States Air Force. These claims are not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the

same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX NAVEDO RAMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of Felix Navedo Ramos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to the father of the late Luis Navedo Ramos, who was fatally injured on April 29, 1941, when struck in Guaynabo, P. R., by a United States Army truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "to" strike out all down to and including the word "accident" in line 10, and insert the following: "Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez, both of Barrio Juan Domingo, Guaynabo, P. R., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the injury and death of their minor son, Luis Navedo-Ramos, who died on April 29, 1941, as the result of personal injuries sustained by him on that date when he was struck by a United States Army truck on Insular Road No. 25 in Guaynabo, P. R."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD J. KEOGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard J. Keogh, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all

claims against the United States for compensation for the injuries and expenses incident thereto, as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, on December 11, 1943, about 10 miles west of Cookeville, Putnam County, Tenn., on United States Highway 70, North: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "compensation" strike out all down to and including the word "North" in line 11, and insert the following: "personal injuries, pain and suffering, and loss of earnings sustained by him as the result of an accident, involving a United States Army vehicle, which occurred on December 11, 1943, about 8 miles west of Cookeville, Putnam County, Tenn., on United States Highway 70, North."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOUTROS MOUALLEM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 554) for the relief of Boutros Mouallem.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Boutros Mouallem shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN SUSTARSIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 588) for the relief of Juan Sustarsic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Juan Sustarsic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO GABER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 590) for the relief of Francesco Gaber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francesco Gaber shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANA COBO ALONSO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 715) for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ana Cobo Alonso shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD KENJI TACHIBANA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 931) for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Bernard Kenji Tachibana, the minor child of Mrs. J. W. Carter, a United States citizen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGNES ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 985) for the relief of Agnes Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Agnes Anderson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT WENDELL TADLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 993) for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provision excluding from admission to the United States persons predominantly of races ineligible to United States citizenship, Robert Wendell Tadlock, a minor child, born in Japan, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Marion C. Tadlock, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "Immigration Act of 1924," insert "as amended."

Page 1, line 4, strike out the last word "any," and insert "the."

Strike out all of lines 5 and 6 and the first word of line 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "provisions of section 13 (c) of that act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA RHEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1052) for the relief of Maria Rhee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Rhee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMELIE SIMHA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1226) for the relief of Emelie Simha.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Emelie Simha, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable bond

or undertaking approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, as a guaranty against the said Emelie Simha becoming institutionalized at public expense or otherwise becoming a public charge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOSHIYUKI MAYESHIRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1426) for the relief of Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro, a minor, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN TZANAVARIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1428) for the relief of John Tzanavaris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien John Tzanavaris shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTHA BRAK FOXWELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2113) for the relief of Martha Brak Foxwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Martha Brak Foxwell may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOACHIM NEMITZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2150) for the relief of Joachim Nemitz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration

Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Joachim Nemitz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. James F. Baker, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNE LORE HART

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2440) for the relief of Hanne Lore Hart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Hanna Lore Hart, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Steven L. Hart, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD CHARLES CLEVERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1114) for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Edward Charles Cleverly, Windsor, Ontario, Dominion of Canada, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in his case of which the Department of Justice has knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KAIKO (KAY) FAIR AND HER MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Mrs. Kaiko (Kay) Fair and her minor children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, excluding from the United States persons ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Kaiko (Kay) Fair, Donald George Fair, Arline Kay Fair, and Curtis Ray Fair, wife and minor children, respectively, of First Sergeant Curtis Allen Fair, who was killed in action in Korea on August 4, 1950. The said Mrs. Kaiko (Kay) Fair and such minor children shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all after the word "to", all of lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, and insert "Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her children, George, Arline Kay, and Curtis Ray. The said Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and such minor."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "under sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended" and insert "as nonquota immigrants."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIKA NICOLO AND HER MINOR CHILD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Erika Nicolo, the fiancée of Edward Dunbar, a United States citizen and a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and her minor child, may be eligible for visas as non-immigrant visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Erika Nicolo is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Edward Dunbar and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Erika Nicolo, and her minor child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Erika Nicolo, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Erika Nicolo and her minor child, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIE BETTELHEIM AND EVELYN LANG HIRSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2182) for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 1469) be substituted.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of

the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2182) was laid on the table.

GERTRUDE MANHAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2221) for the relief of Gertrude Manhal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Gertrude Manhal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. sec. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTHER ANNA FASULO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2296) for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mother Anna Fasulo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax, following which arrangements shall be made for cancellation of the outstanding departure bond. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "following which, arrangements shall be made for cancellation of the outstanding departure bond."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER MARIA SALERNO ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno,

Eufрасisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufрасisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year or years that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ODETTE LOUISE TIRMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2346) for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (a)), or any provisions of the act of March 4, 1929, relating to entry after deportation (8 U. S. C. 180), Odette Louise Tirman, the wife of a citizen of the United States, and the mother of three United States citizen children, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided,* That she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JEANNETTE THORN PEASE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2587) for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease, a native-born former citizen of the United States, born in Morristown, N. J., on August 30, 1889, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIMI FONG AND HER CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2903) for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mimi Fong, the Chinese fiancée of Corp. Nguey F. Wong, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Army, and her children, Sing Lee and Lily, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Mimi Fong is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Corp. Nguey Wong, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mimi Fong and her children, they shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mimi Fong and her children, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mimi Fong and her children as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes.

With the following committee amendments.

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "Corporal."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "citizen", strike out "now serving in the United States Army" and insert "veteran of World War II."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "Corporal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SETSUYO SUMIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 204 (b)), shall be held and considered to be applicable to Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATALE JOSEPH JOHN RATTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3378) for the relief of Natale Joseph John Ratti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Natale Joseph John Ratti, a naturalized citizen of the United States, who lost his citizenship through his inability to return to the United States, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

Sec. 2. From and after naturalization under this act, Mr. Ratti shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. sec. 204 (b)), shall be held and considered to be applicable to Natale Joseph John Ratti."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YING CHEE JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Ying Chee Jung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Ying Chee Jung, the minor, unmarried child of Phillip Jung, a native-born citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEPHAN JOSEPH HORVATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3732) for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of race ineligible to citizenship, Stephan Joseph Horvath, a minor child under the care of Technical Sergeant and Mrs. S. J. Horvath, Jr., both citizens of the United States residing temporarily in Japan, shall be held and considered for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, to be the natural-born alien child of the said Technical Sergeant and Mrs. S. J. Horvath, Jr.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out ", a minor child under" and insert in lieu thereof "and Lucas Elbert Horvath, minor children under."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "child" and insert in lieu thereof "children."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSUTAKO KUROKI MASUDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tsutako Kuroki Masuda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. Alvin J. Lovett, a citizen of the United States. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of such act, the said Tsutako Kuroki Masuda may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOR TERESA GEA MARTINEZ ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of Sor Teresa Gea Martinez, Sor Eufrosia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sor Teresa Gea Martinez, Sor Eufrosia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza, from San Juan, Puerto Rico, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for residence, as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Sor Teresa Gea Martinez."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "four" and insert in lieu thereof "three."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sor Eufrosia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. ERNEST AYRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5526) for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dr. J. Ernest Ayre, if found otherwise admissible to citizenship, may be naturalized under this act upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

(a) no declaration of intention, no certificate of arrival, and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; and

(b) the petition for naturalization shall be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction prior to the expiration of 6 months immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA LAURETTA PRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5805) for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Patricia Lauretta Pray, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Lawrence Pray, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGEBORG AND ANNA LUKAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5956) for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Ingeborg and Anna Lukas shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Lukas, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE W. GOODYEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5958) for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Pauline W. Goodyear may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHIKO NAKASHIMA

The clerk called the bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of Michiko Nakashima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, shall not apply to Michiko Nakashima, Japanese minor child in the care of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Fred W. Homan, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Michiko Nakashima shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of the said Master Sgt. and Mrs. Fred W. Homan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIMMY DOGUTA (ALSO KNOWN AS JIMMY BLAGG)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5984) for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, shall not apply to Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg), Japanese minor child in the care of Technical Sergeant and Mrs. Collin O. Blagg, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jimmy Doguta shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of the said Technical Sergeant and Mrs. Collin O. Blagg.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIAN DIANE DELPHINE SACHS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6265) for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (g) of section 201 of the Nationality Act of 1940, Marian Diane Delphine Sachs, a United States citizen at birth, shall be held and considered to have retained her said United States citizenship regardless of any period of residence outside of the United States: *Provided,* That the said Marian Diane Delphine Sachs shall be physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling 5 years between the ages of 14 and 28 years: *Provided further,* That, if she is abroad for such time that it becomes impossible for her to complete 5 years of physical presence in the United States or its outlying possessions before reaching the age of 28 years, her American citizenship shall thereupon cease.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIKO OSHIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6314) for the relief of Kiko Oshiro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to the minor child Kiko Oshiro. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Kiko Oshiro shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor daughter of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Blevin L. Zeumalt, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORDON E. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1749) for the relief of Gordon E. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Gordon E. Smith is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States such sums, (amounting in the aggregate to approximately \$1,006.25) as were received by him as additional pay for duty requiring aerial flights, pursuant to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, on account of flight duty performed by him in the months of March through September 1946 as a sanitarian, United States Public Health Service, while assigned to duty with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Greece.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gordon E. Smith the sum of \$143.75, which sum was repaid by him to the United States under protest pursuant to a decision of the Comptroller General (B-90700, January 13, 1950) disallowing payment of such additional pay to the said Gordon E. Smith for such duty: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HATTIE TRUAX GRAHAM, FORMERLY HATTIE TRUAX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1949) for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, Cloverdale, Ind., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, for the death of her former husband, Ola Truax, on January 21, 1944, who died as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (Congressional No. 17857, decided April 3, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 268, 81st Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of the death: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. DAVID H. PERKINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2004) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins, of Montpelier, Idaho, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Carlos M. Perkins, who was killed in the Philippine Islands on December 14, 1941, while destroying dynamite, gasoline, oil, and other supplies to prevent them from falling into the hands of the enemy: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET F. BRADSHAW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2005) for the relief of Harriet F. Bradshaw.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harriet F. Bradshaw, the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, property damage and medical expenses, sustained by her as the result of a motor vehicle accident involving an Army truck in which she was riding on Frankfurterstrasse, Weisbaden, Germany, on July 6, 1947: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRITT-MARIE ERIKSSON AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2418) for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, author-

ized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Britt-Marie Eriksson, Skogshogskolan, Stockholm, Sweden, the sum of \$696.33; to Folke Desire l'Anglois-Nordgren, 41 Kjeldsgaardsvej, Copenhagen-Valby, Denmark, the sum of \$2,859.04; to Paddans Resebureau, Gothenburg, Sweden, the sum of \$85.90; to Bengt Dahlberg, Eremitvagen 5, Stockholm, Sweden, the sum of \$60; to Eric Johansson, Hokegatan 2, Gothenburg, Sweden, the sum of \$15; to Inger Norell Goteborgs Bank, Halmstad, Sweden, the sum of \$10; and to G. Liedholm, Pressebo, Sweden, the sum of \$20, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for the damages sustained by them as the result of an incident involving five soldiers of the United States Army, which occurred at Unterammergau, Germany, on August 5, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE H. SOFFEL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2628) for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the George H. Soffel Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of \$5,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for the amount of liquidated damages withheld from the George H. Soffel Co. in connection with contract No. IM-3757 entered into by it with the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior. No loss or damage by reason of the performance under such contract was occasioned to the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. NEIL ANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4037) for the relief of M. Neil Andrews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 1204 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, or any other provision of law, there shall be paid out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of judges of the district courts of the United States, to M. Neil Andrews a sum representing the

salary of a judge of a district court of the United States for the period which the said M. Neil Andrews served as district judge for the northern district of Georgia after August 9, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORMA J. ROBERTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of Norma J. Roberts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, 5227 Q Street, Omaha, Neb., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and all expenses incident thereto sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States soldier stationed at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Neb., on May 5, 1951. Such soldier was not acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY YARLOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4069) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucy Yarlott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue to Lucy Yarlott a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the northeast quar-

ter, and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, and lot 3 of section 10, township 9 south, range 34 east, Montana principal meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "Lucy Yarlott", add "Othermedicine"; and on page 1, line 9, after the period, insert "The prior disposition of the homestead land of Lucy Yarlott Othermedicine is hereby ratified and confirmed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucy Yarlott Othermedicine."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGNES STEVENS FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4218) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Agnes Stevens Fisher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Agnes Stevens Fisher a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The southeast quarter of section 22, the north half of section 27, and the southwest quarter of section 23, township 7 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, insert "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 592, Rept. No. 1675), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Albert	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Hébert	O'Konski
Bailey	Hedrick	Patterson
Baker	Heller	Poulson
Boykin	Herlong	Powell
Buchanan	Hollifield	Rains
Buckley	Horan	Reams
Buffett	Hull	Reed, Ill.
Burdick	Javits	Rhodes
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Case	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Chelf	Kersten, Wis.	Sasser
Chiperfield	Larcade	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	McDonough	Shelley
Combs	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	McKinnon	Stockman
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Velde
Doyle	Morgan	Weichel
Flood	Morrison	Welch
Gordon	Morton	Widnall
Granger	Murdock	Wilson, Ind.
Harrison, Nebr.	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. RABAUT. 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. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the other half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 7268, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, in presenting to the House of Representatives for its consideration H. R. 7268, a bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, I am confident that a large majority of the Members of the House will support this appropriation because it provides funds for carrying on vital items of navigation and flood control improvements in practically

every section of the country. Unfortunately there are those, both in and out of Congress, who are prone to assign uncomplimentary labels to such legislation for the very reason that it does benefit widespread sections of the country and therefore interests many Members of Congress. At a time when we are calling on our taxpayers to devote large sums of money to develop backward areas throughout the world it is incomprehensible that such thoughtless attacks should be made on this meritorious development in our country.

However meritorious, these improvements like all other civil functions of our Government, at this time, have unfortunately had to take a proportionate cut and the initiation of recently authorized works has been prohibited, due to more compelling requirements of national security. The funds here requested are the bare minimum considered essential to continue works under way and to meet serious emergencies where they exist. Before going into an item-by-item discussion of the provisions of this bill I believe it appropriate, if not essential, that I take the time of the House for a few general remarks.

All the projects for which funds are requested add to the wealth of the United States. They protect the lives and property of our people. Harbors must be kept open. Impediments to navigation must be removed. Channels need widening and deepening at existing bottlenecks. Navigation improvements since the beginning have paid in benefits several times over the Federal expenditure made for their construction. Flood control improvements on the lower Mississippi River—the oldest Federal flood-control project—have paid over \$5 in benefits for each Federal dollar expended. Flood control generally throughout the United States—first authorized in 1936—has already repaid about \$1.50 in benefits for each Federal dollar expended. These projects have only begun to produce the anticipated benefits and they will have many years of highly useful life ahead of them.

No other nation can boast of an inland water transportation system such as exists in our country. No nation can equal what we have done in less than two decades for flood threatened areas of our country. And no nation in the world can match our Corps of Engineers, a body of men of superior intellect in their chosen profession, that has served the Nation both in peace and in war in an exemplary manner.

From the beginning the Corps of Engineers has been closely associated with our Federal program of internal improvements and today is still the only general engineering organization in the Government service. In time of peace the corps' most important civil engineering activity is the improvement of our waterways for navigation and the control of floods.

The first river and harbor legislation enacted by Congress in 1789 consisted merely in assenting to certain improvements sponsored by the individual States. The first appropriation for river and harbor improvements was made in 1824 and from that time to the War Be-

tween the States, Congress periodically provided appropriations for this purpose. The close of that war and the return of industrial activity brought to the front the necessity for an even more comprehensive program to provide reasonable facilities for our ever-growing commerce. From 1866 to 1920, Congress continued to pass these periodical river and harbor bills, and in 1920 adopted its present policy of enacting general river and harbor legislation to include the authorization of definite projects and the expenditures necessary for the completion of these projects every several years. In the annual Department of the Army appropriations there is made available a lump sum for application to these authorized projects. No legislation which comes before Congress receives more critical examination or stands more on its own merits than do these river and harbor and now, flood control authorization and appropriation bills. No committees of Congress receive more expert and disinterested advice than do the Public Works and Appropriation Committees from the Army engineers in their investigations into the merits of the individual projects and their requests for construction funds.

The necessity for these improvements and the important part which they play in the life of America is but little understood. In the early days of the Republic its expansion was governed in large part by its rivers, as these highways provided by nature were the only reliable means of transporting even the simple necessities of our pioneer ancestors. Today, in our modern complex civilization, the importance of water-borne commerce in the daily life of every citizen is even more evident, and the very necessities of this life depend on facilities for commerce and particularly water-borne commerce. Flood protection of these navigation arteries and the industry and agriculture that crowd their banks is equally important. Great floods such as those on the lower Mississippi River in 1927, in New England and the eastern seaboard in 1936, on the Ohio in 1936 and 1937, on the Missouri in 1943, 1944, and 1945, on the Columbia in 1948, in California in 1950, and most recently at Kansas City, take an annual toll in damages running into hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, the total losses in these floods alone have amounted to more than all the appropriations that have been made for flood-control works.

River cities, such as Cincinnati, St. Louis, Memphis, and New Orleans, have been built up by low-cost water transportation and would have to alter their commercial existence were it not for the advantages afforded by improved streams. Nor could they continue to function as great cities without flood protection. It is no accident that, of the 36 cities of this Nation with populations of 300,000 or more, 30 are on federally improved navigable waterways.

We cannot leave our homes and go into the streets without coming into direct contact with modern necessities and conveniences imported to provide us with a more comfortable existence. The asphalt on our streets, the tires on the

automobiles using the streets, have become practicable for use only because their cost has been brought within reach by the improvements of our waterways and harbors. These improvements are, of course, paid for indirectly by each and every one of us, but each and every one of us receives a direct return from our investment. There is no public expenditure that is so useful and fairly distributed, both as to cost and benefit, as these improvements. The cost to any one individual is small, and the benefits reaped are continuous and ever present in our daily lives, composing a part of every meal, of every-day wearing apparel, and affecting our daily heat, light, and the other necessities and luxuries enjoyed by the American citizen.

The use of these articles is taken for granted, and the average man in the street, when he visualizes a waterway, thinks of it as a natural gift to mankind. This is far from true. Our Atlantic coast was provided by nature with but one harbor with a draft of 30 feet. New York Harbor, the greatest port in the world, with an annual tonnage of about 150,000,000, having a probable value of \$100,000,000,000, had a natural entrance channel of only 23 feet, which has been increased by the Federal Government to a depth of 45 feet and a width of 2,000 feet, with many interconnected channels and anchorage basins.

The great ports of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf ports, including the booming Texas oil ports, the ore and coal centers of the Great Lakes, and our inland waterways reaching far into the interior of the country and providing the agricultural regions with transportation costs comparable to those of the seacoast, have all been improved by the Federal Government and have played an ever-increasing part in the growth of the industrial and commercial life of the Nation. These developments, which have given the American Nation a system of harbors and waterways equaled by no other nation in the world, have resulted from far-seeing vision and skillful engineering execution.

Congress throughout the years has appropriated a total of \$3,700,000,000 for maintenance and improvement of our harbors and waterways, which handle an annual commerce of 760,000,000 tons. There have been appropriated \$3,500,000,000 for flood-control improvements which protect some 750 communities and over 26,000,000 acres of land. Since the first authorization by Congress this work has been carried out quietly and efficiently by the Army engineers. There is not an organization which seeks publicity in the unobtrusive performance of its work, and I would feel that I had neglected my own duty if I did not take this opportunity to speak briefly of its record and achievements.

First organized by the Continental Congress in 1776, and definitely established by Congress in 1890 under the leadership of Brigadier General du Pont, a distinguished French volunteer, this organization has since been in continued existence, and from its earliest days, has been charged with many of the

more important construction and engineering activities of the Government.

Its officers are honor graduates of the United States Military Academy or selected graduates of our leading technical schools. These officers are given a year of postgraduate training in specially chosen technical subjects, and are further trained by actual field experience in responsible positions. Their responsibilities are increased as rapidly as experience permits. They are aided in their work by a civil engineering organization containing the highest type of engineering talent available in this country and imbued with the same spirit and traditions. The names on the roster of the Corps of Engineers include some of the most illustrious in American history. Lee, Beauregard, Meade, McClellan, Joseph E. Johnston, Halleck, McPherson, Goethals, and Siebert, and their successors of today, MacArthur and Pick, are men who have contributed much to the progress of America. Their work has included, in addition to the supervision of river and harbor improvements, many other engineering achievements of note. McNeil and Whistler were both Army engineers who played an outstanding part in the development of the country's first railroad system. Much of the early exploration and mapping of the great West was under the direction of this corps, which has been charged for many years with special surveys for the Federal Government.

The work entrusted to the Army engineers and the Mississippi River Commission by the Congress has been an outstanding example of national planning. First there has been the arduous task of finding the facts—not only the physical facts, but the effect, often far-reaching, of each proposed move on other conditions and interests. Then there has been the work of preparing a program that will conserve the Nation's resources, develop its possibilities, provide for the future, and build up the permanent well-being of the country and its people.

Advance planning for additional future works of river and harbor improvement and of flood control has continued with the prosecution of works under construction. Plans are prepared for the prompt commencement of further works of improvement, of widespread public benefit, all of which have been maturely investigated on the initiative of Congress, recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and enacted by the Congress.

For several years only limited funds have been appropriated to start new projects and this bill follows the same pattern. I wish it were not so. There are a number of highly important projects that have been authorized for 2 or more years that I personally would like to see started, but the necessary funds for their initiation cannot be recommended at this time. A better balanced program providing for a fair number of "new starts" and for a greater rate of progress on those projects that are under way would be desirable, and I can assure you that the committee will recommend the funds to finance such a program as soon as it is prudent to do so.

I think all members are familiar with the widespread demand for more and more power. The use of electric power is probably greater now than it has ever been before. The Corps of Engineers have recognized this demand and are prosecuting their multiple purpose projects as vigorously as funds and materials will permit. I can point out that 58 percent of the funds asked for construction are to be used on projects involving the development of hydroelectric power.

The appropriation recommended by the committee in this bill is the minimum considered essential to provide for reasonable progress on projects that are under construction. These projects may be generally classified as, having an important effect on the present defense effort of the Nation, providing additional electric power in areas where there is a serious power shortage, affording flood protection to industrial communities and agricultural areas that are vital to our current defense program, and continuing or completing works that are well underway and cannot now be suspended without threatening serious physical and financial loss.

I will conclude my general remarks by saying to the House of Representatives that these national improvements are assets of this great Nation serving our citizens every minute of the day and standing ready to move forward steadily to meet the modern needs of the country—a work which has proved that the democratic methods in vogue now are efficient and successful with respect to waterway improvements. This success has been and will be accomplished through the cooperation and wisdom of every Member of the House of Representatives combined with the same spirit among the distinguished Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am tremendously interested in the inland waterways and transportation on the inland waterways. The gentleman may remember that in the State of North Carolina last year a serious condition arose as to the maintenance of existing projects. It was learned that the engineers had diverted such funds as had been allocated to the State of North Carolina for maintenance, and there were no funds available to maintain projects to the authorized depth—projects that were being used. Therefore, I am asking with respect to maintenance in this appropriation bill for authorized water projects what division is being made as between States, and what certainty will anyone else in the position of the State of North Carolina have as to whether there will be maintenance money to maintain the projects that are being used and keep them to the project depth.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will take the report at the top of page 5, he will see the whole thing displayed.

Mr. BONNER. I saw the table.

Mr. RABAUT. Funds in the amount of \$67,105,000 are contained for operation and maintenance:

While the committee is cognizant of the fact that emergencies may arise calling for the unanticipated expenditure of funds on certain projects, it will expect the Corps of Engineers to more rigidly adhere to the tentative allocation of operation and maintenance funds presented in justification of these estimates than has been true in the past.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, it has been a sad experience in the past.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, we are bringing it to their attention.

Mr. BONNER. Yet I say that these funds are given to the engineers in a lump sum to be used as they see fit to the best advantage. That is the condition laid down.

Mr. RABAUT. It looks to the best interests of the country.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the only way we could do it.

Mr. BONNER. I want to say to the gentleman, since he injected himself into this question I raised, that the interests of my State have been poorly served. The record will show it.

Does the gentleman desire to give me a little more information about this question?

Mr. FORD. I can give the gentleman some facts in reference to this that might be helpful. When the Army engineers made their justifications, they set forth tentative subtotals on which they based their total.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman have figures for North Carolina?

Mr. FORD. I have before me in the justifications the amounts they expect tentatively to allocate to several projects in North Carolina. If the gentleman would care for it, I would be glad to read them into the RECORD.

Mr. BONNER. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. FORD. Maintenance of channels and harbors in North Carolina: The Atlantic intracoastal waterway, Wilmington district, \$235,000; Cape Fear River above Wilmington, \$37,600,000; Morehead City Harbor, \$188,000; Wilmington Harbor, \$282,000; Rollinson Channel, \$28,200.

For the operation and care of locks, dams, and canals, Atlantic intracoastal waterway, Wilmington district, \$85,000; and Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C., \$300,000.

Mr. BONNER. Yes. I thank the gentleman. The attention of the membership should be called to the fact that the intercoastal waterway serves all the Atlantic States. That item specified provides service to all the Atlantic States but, of course, it is charged against the deep sea ports of Wilmington and Morehead City.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The justifications the gentleman read are not of allocations to the whole United States, but to Wilmington Harbor.

Mr. BONNER. The point is that there are many local or inland ports that are

tributaries to the inland waterway. When the inland waterway was built it provided a draft of 12 feet. The depth of the tributary channels run from 7 to 9 feet. We experience it generally on the inland waterway that a full cargo, 12-foot load, cannot get in to the small ports where the entrance channels are only 7 or 9 foot draft. I am sure other Members of Congress have experienced similar difficulties with respect to feeder ports; the small feeder ports for the commerce of the inland waterway. To secure maximum service from the inland waterway, the depth in feeder ports must conform to 12-foot depth of the inland waterway.

There is one other question I would like to ask: What consideration, if any, has the Appropriations Committee given, or has it ever discussed with the engineers the proposition of the States contributing to these civil works and functions as the States contribute to the road program and other programs? Has that ever been discussed in the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me I think I can answer the question.

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was connected with one harbor project for 8 years where the Army engineers did a perfectly marvelous job. In the House Document authorizing the project, provision was made for contribution by local interests. It varies depending on the conditions surrounding each particular project. For instance, in the case of the project about which I am talking, the city of Stockton, and that area in California, we contributed almost \$3,000,000 before we got through. For instance, we had to provide terminal facilities and we had to get rights of way for channel levee, and spoil disposal areas and other Federal requirements. We made a very substantial contribution; in fact, it was larger than the Federal contribution.

In the case of flood control projects the Federal Government has not asked that they be set up on a contributing basis because in 1938 the policy was laid down that the Nation would assume the responsibility for flood-control works.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman. I do think, however, that it is getting so out of balance that there should be general legislation to bring about a matching contribution in this public works program similar to the one we have in the public roads program and other things, letting those who desire the benefits participate on a basis of share and share alike throughout the country.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to make one suggestion for the benefit of Members who are interested in these projects. The procedure we follow in the State of California is that the State has created what is known as a State Water Council. We have many flood control and harbor projects. The State Water Council holds extensive hearings throughout the State on merits of various projects; then that organization screens them and determines which ones they are going to recommend and which they will not

recommend for appropriations. When they have done that they have the authority of the State behind them. So their recommendations are official so far as the State of California is concerned as to what projects and what amounts they think should be appropriated by the Congress. We have very little chance to get in any of these so-called unrecommended projects because our State has screened them all and the Civil Functions Committee logically adheres to the ones recommended by the State Water Council.

Mr. KERR. I am quite sure that my distinguished and able colleague will be able to take care of the State of North Carolina. I am satisfied he has done very good work down there on several occasions and you may expect the great State of North Carolina, one of the big taxpaying States of the Nation, will be taken care of.

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman that I appreciate his compliment very much, and I am going to ask the Committee to allow me 5 minutes here. I am going to show this House that there are two projects in my congressional district, in one of which great damage was brought about by the engineers but nothing has ever been done about it and another project that cannot be used for the reason it is not reported in the budget to the Appropriations Committee. Therefore the inland waterways will never serve its purpose unless we can get the feeder ports constructed to a depth to conform with the channel of the inland waterway. The only way you can take care of it is to get a little money in this appropriation bill. This applies not only to my district but to other districts.

Mr. KERR. I hope the gentleman will continue to get corrected what he feels should be corrected down there and I feel confident that ultimately he will get all of this and we will all be proud of him.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the sense that an appropriation bill can be referred to as a good bill or a bad bill, I think it is fair to say that this represents a good bill. It is the result of a considerable amount of fair and open, give-and-take, among the members of the subcommittee, the kind of enlightened and selective cutting that resulted in a unanimous report to the House.

I suppose that among Members of the House generally that any appropriation bill that has been cut as deeply as this one has been cut, can hardly merit the general recognition of being good. Insofar as members of the House are vitally concerned with the various, individual projects, and properly so, then I suppose a bill cut as this one has been, would be referred to as a bad bill. Among the other members of the House who do not have the direct or vital concern with the projects which are included, and who commonly refer to this as the pork-barrel bill, then I suppose with respect to them, because there is any money at all appropriated in the bill, it can hardly be called a good bill.

But, as I said, as a result of fair subcommittee deliberation, I think this represents a good bill.

I do want to express my appreciation to the majority members of the subcommittee for the fairness which they exhibited both in the hearings and in the marking up of this measure, and also express my appreciation to my industrious, capable, and conscientious colleague of the minority, the gentleman from Michigan. Because of an additional assignment, which I was given on the Committee on Appropriations during part of these hearings, he carried the burden of the minority alone, and yet I think everyone will agree that he carried the burden very well.

This bill represents a cut from a budget request of about \$693,000,000 in round numbers to \$492,000,000 as presented here to the House. In other words, the cut exceeds \$200,000,000 and represents a cut of 28.9 percent.

The subcommittee operated under certain ground rules similar to those which it operated under last year. First of all, it was decided that we would stay within the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. Secondly, that there would be no new starts during this time of critical finances and critical materials. Thirdly, that there should be a minimum amount allotted for examination and surveys for new projects. There is included in this bill \$635,000 of unearmarked, examination, and survey funds. There is \$2,000,000 represented in that figure of \$2,635,000 which is shown in the bill, which is earmarked for the fish and wildlife studies on the lower Columbia River. With respect to examinations and surveys and flood control, there is slightly over a million dollars which has not been earmarked.

Then the fourth ground rule was that we would allow no new money for the planning of projects. I think that position was pretty well established last year, and the basis for it continues to exist. There are many authorized projects, which are not under construction, and we felt that to allow additional planning funds would serve to spread out and thin out the efforts of the Corps of Engineers to an unreasonable degree. That does not mean that there will be no funds used for planning this year, because there is a substantial unobligated balance both in rivers and harbors and flood control, which can be spent for the planning of projects during this year.

The fifth general ground rule was this, and this is the last one I will mention: that where a project is well along toward completion, substantially the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is contained in this bill. Once a project gets over the hump and is on the way to be finished, it represents good economy to get that project finished, so that it can provide a return on the money that is invested in it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. On that point I think the gentleman is proceeding on wise ground with reference to his rule. I know of one project, however, that is 78 percent completed, and the engineers have asked for funds which would have made it 92 percent completed. A project

of that sort, in your judgment, should be completed, according to your statement?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In the absence of unusual circumstances, I would say so. I do not know what project the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. BROOKS. I will call the gentleman's attention to the project. It appears on page 394 of the hearings. General Chorpeneing says it will be 62 percent completed with the funds received this year and will be 89 percent completed with the funds that we are asking for for the fiscal year 1953. That is on page 395 of the hearings. The project is not in my district, I will say to the gentleman, but I do happen to know it is a very important project. That is the Natchitoches project. It is a diversion project. It is not in my district, but I do join with the gentleman in his statement when he says that a project that close to completion should be completed. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think the facts show that was a project which was unbudgeted last year, and which was put in by the other body.

Mr. BROOKS. And the conferees agreed to it.

Mr. FORD. Yes, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] did not agree to it.

I think also that that project was one that could be completed with the funds that are presently on hand.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman may know more than the hearings disclose. General Chorpeneing, who is Assistant Chief, did not say that in the hearings. If the gentleman has more information, I would like to have it.

Mr. FORD. Unfortunately not all of the facts are always included in the hearings.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In support of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] said, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] that the subcommittee is informed that the engineers did not use the money which was appropriated for that project last year.

Mr. BROOKS. They testified in response to a question by Mr. FORD that the contract would be let in April, and I think they are to be praised for not rushing into a contract before they were ready to do it. They said when it was let in April the amount which the budget approved would make the project 92 percent completed.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan, and then I hope the gentleman will allow me to finish my general statement.

Mr. DONDERO. The question I wanted to ask the gentleman is, I notice in the tabulation there is practically no money for surveys, or a very nominal amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Six hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars for

rivers and harbors and \$1,215,000 under flood control.

Mr. DONDERO. That is \$1,700,000 altogether.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. One million eight hundred and forty-five thousand dollars altogether.

Mr. DONDERO. What a great many Members cannot understand—and I am not offering this as any criticism of your committee. I think you are reflecting generally the public opinion of the country to reduce public expenditures, but what we cannot understand is this, whether or not this Government is taking an inconsistent position when we cut out work in our own country and allow half a billion dollars for improvement of the Rhone River in France. The trouble with our projects is that they are not over there in Europe; if they were money would be allotted to them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe any comment is necessary. The gentlemen on our subcommittee did not have the Rhone project before them or there might have been a different result in that.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This is not on any project, but, as I understand, the President issued an order tying up the funds for public works on projects covered in this bill shortly after he started the war in Korea. Is that Executive order still in operation and made applicable to projects that he does not consider in the interest of national defense?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There is the general rule still in existence that there must be a clearance with respect to defense necessity, and that is reflected in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have been told, because I happen to have 150 miles of the Mississippi River in my district, and I am not asking for anything, but I have been told that in the case of certain surveys that are partially completed, that because of an Executive order those projects were not in the interest of national defense, they could not go forward. If that rule is still in operation I want to ask whether the money that is provided in this bill for certain projects will be withdrawn if the projects are not found to be in the interest of national defense and that the work will not go forward.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would assume that that would be true, inasmuch as that order is still in effect.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then we can probably save a lot of money cutting out a great many of these projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Bureau of the Budget recommendation, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, represents the President's establishment, and so it may be assumed that that question was settled at the time the Bureau of the Budget sent their recommendation down; we would assume they had clearance by the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. One further question. I have a project which was provided for back in the Eighteenth

Congress involving a few thousand dollars.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman mean authorized?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It was authorized and money was made available, but the money was recovered back into the fund and the project was not proceeded with. We have been told that if the project is to go forward we must come before Congress and get another appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Aside from the order of the President in that respect, the gentleman will recall that there was a general rescission of funds because the Congress directed the President to cut back some of the funds in these flood-control projects.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This happens to be a harbor project on the Mississippi River. The funds were provided in the Eightieth Congress, which was a good Congress; but I have been told that we will have to get another Republican Congress to pass another appropriation for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will let me proceed, I want to conclude a statement on the general rules used by the subcommittee before we go too far, because it will perhaps forestall questions that otherwise might be asked with respect to specific projects.

The rule of no new starts, for instance, explains why the Hartwell Dam, the Tunnel Creek Reservoir, the Cape Girardeau, and the Topeka flood-control projects, lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa, and Ice Harbor locks and dam were not included. In addition, there were some projects, while they cannot be specifically called new projects, that were not included because of unusual circumstances relating to them.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

There are specific circumstances which explain the committee's refusal to grant funds. One of them is The Dalles in Washington; another is Gavins Point in Nebraska; another is the Niagara River in New York; and a fourth is Cheatham lock and dam on the Tennessee. In each case there was not sufficient exact data as to the amounts of money involved in these projects, that caused the committee to decide that it would be in the interest of economy as well as efficient construction that those projects be deferred.

With respect to administration expenses, which is always a matter of interest to Members of the House, let me say that the committee denied 18 new positions, requested in the office of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. It made specific reductions totaling about 9 percent in the administration costs which are allocated within the various construction projects. That cut does not apply to the administration of the Mississippi River Commission in which average employment has been reduced from 261 in 1949 to 199 in 1951, a reduction of almost one-quarter of the personnel in the course of the last 2 years.

The appropriation for the Panama Canal shows a large cut percentage-wise, but that is a reflection of the determination of the Congress that the Panama Canal Zone and the Panama Canal are to be, at least primarily, self-sustaining. The Congress in 1951 passed legislation reorganizing the Canal Zone set-up and the Canal Zone. It was an attempt to assure that that would be self-sustaining. The tolls of the Panama Canal have been revised only once since the Canal went into operation and that was in 1937 when the effect of the revision was to reduce the tolls that had been charged. The subcommittee felt that was completely unrealistic and the report so states.

One other matter of interest and that is with respect to the schedule of rental of Government quarters. If you will look on page 13 of our report you will notice the rentals now in effect which are based on a completely unrealistic schedule which has been put into effect by order of the executive departments. The subcommittee attempted to get at that last year by putting language in the report, and while the executive agencies have furnished us with statements as to what they expect to do, the recommendations of the subcommittee, as far as actual practice goes, have been so far ignored. We brought that up again this year and the chairman of the full committee has assured us that by the time the final supplemental bill comes before the House we will have an opportunity to insert language that will apply across-the-board in all agencies of the Government, which will assure a reasonable and fair return to the Government of the United States on those housing units that are made available to Federal personnel.

In summary, I would say that this bill, as brought to you by the subcommittee unanimously, represents a realistic balance between the need for river and harbor and flood-control construction and maintenance and an equally critical need for rock bottom reduction in expenses of the Federal Government. I hope that the House will accept the subcommittee's report without any changes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire of the gentleman concerning his position and the position of the subcommittee relative to examination and survey funds for flood control. On page 6 you have the sum of \$1,215,000, under the title of "Examination, Survey, Planning and Other Study Programs." I notice that the Army engineers requested the sum of \$1,600,000 for some 90 different projects in some 35 different States. What is this \$1,215,000 to be spent for and who is going to determine the projects upon which that money will be spent?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The subcommittee was not able to specifically earmark those examination and survey funds for each of those projects. That would be very difficult from a practical viewpoint. But, it did make a substan-

tial reduction, still permitting this money to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers, and I suppose we will have to accept them as the experts who will make the determination as to where it should be used and permit them to allocate those funds among the projects.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Does not the gentleman realize that this puts the Army engineers in a rather awkward situation? I have only a little project included in this list of 90. I submit there are many Members on this floor who have their own projects. Now, when I call the Army engineers concerning my project—incidentally, it amounts to only \$20,000 of this total—they can very easily tell me, "Well, we are sorry. We have had to use this money on some other project." Now what is the objection to the subcommittee recommending the full amount of \$1,600,000, a difference of \$385,000, and obviate all of this embarrassment to the Army engineers, and at the same time assuring the completion of the reports on these projects, many of which are as much as 80 percent complete?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not too much concerned about the Army engineers being embarrassed by that. The gentleman has had experience with other agencies of the Government in which he called them up to try to get some information or to get something done, in which they told him, "I am sorry, Mr. Congressman, but Congress did not allow enough money to do that job." You have had that happen with other agencies. If we are going to allot everything that is asked for in order to obviate that embarrassment to the Corps of Engineers, what are you going to do with the other agencies?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Let us relieve the Army engineers of their embarrassment and assume the same ourselves. What am I going to tell the people in my district if I cannot get \$20,000 to complete the report on a flood-control project which is of great importance to them?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, what are all of the Members of Congress going to tell their people? There are many projects that have had not only some survey done but the planning completed, and are ready to start construction. Yet Members have to tell their people, just as all the rest of us are going to have to tell our people, that Uncle Sam just does not have enough money to go around.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Ah, but they read the next day that billions of dollars have been appropriated for projects in foreign countries, as was just mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. They will not believe me. They refuse to accept such an answer. They want a better excuse than that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not one of those who sympathizes with the view that we ought to spend billions at home because we are spending billions abroad.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not want to get into a controversy with the gentleman, but I just want to know why you did not include the additional \$385,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think that requires a lengthy explanation. It is the same situation we have everywhere else, that we simply cannot appropriate all the money asked for.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Last year your committee took the attitude that no money should be appropriated for this work. Now this year you have provided only a partial amount of the total requested by the Army engineers.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In order to permit them to complete examination of critical projects.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This is not enough for all of the projects.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; I do not believe that will complete them all. But, there are other projects in the country in the same position. They will have to wait their time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman's committee did not designate the projects on which this money should be expended.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We did not. Mr. CHENOWETH. You left that determination up to the Army engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We felt that was the only practical way to handle it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for his kindness in yielding to me. I feel this is a very important matter and I am glad to have his comments.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Central and South Florida flood control project. Since the start of construction in the early part of 1950, the Corps of Engineers have constructed, or are now completing, a 110-mile levee barrier which will provide nearly 700,000 people and almost a billion and a quarter dollars worth of property with protection against a recurrence of the devastating floods of 1947.

South Florida suffered approximately \$50,000,000 in damages in the floods of 1947; \$25,000,000 damage resulted from water again in 1949; and \$50,000,000 loss occurred from the floods of 1950.

As a resident of Miami Springs, I recall wading around in water for days. My children were unable to go to school for several days because of the disastrous flood that hit our area in 1947. I remember all of us having to take typhoid shots, and while it isn't so pleasant to talk about, the high waters had caused septic tanks in the area to overflow, which brought about the imminent danger of an epidemic.

Since much of the area in which these flood conditions occur is agricultural, a recurrence of such losses would have a resultant effect of lessening our agricultural production and present a serious threat to our whole mobilization effort.

We do not wish to see another disaster in south Florida such as the one a few years ago, which took 2,500 lives around the Lake Okeechobee region. We desire to prevent further serious losses to the farmers of south Florida. We know that the municipalities and local units of government, in the areas affected with past floods, would be financially unable to cope with another flood problem. Hence, those of us in south Florida are solely dependent upon the flood-control program to prevent a recurrence of these and more serious conditions.

But, in addition, this appropriation is a sound investment for the Federal Government. Increased productivity in this area will return more in taxes alone than the sum approved by the committee. Early completion of this project is clearly within the national interest.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss with you briefly the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. This is the oldest authorized flood-control project in the bill. It was authorized in 1929. The total authorization is \$1,202,748,500. The Congress has appropriated, minus maintenance, \$769,466,223; remaining to be appropriated after fiscal year 1952, \$523,282,277.

I am not going to attempt to get reinstated any of the funds the committee removed, but I think it should be called to the attention of the committee that the Corps of Army Engineers requested of the budget \$119,238,786, but for some reason unknown to me, and I believe to the members of the committee, the budget reduced this request to \$60,520,000, or, in other words, almost 50 percent.

In making the reduction there are many projects under construction that will have to be stopped. I should like to enumerate them briefly.

There is the St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo. This important flood-control project benefits 2,000,000 acres of rich agricultural area and was cut from the needed \$3,409,000 to \$500,000.

Lower White River, Ark. Important flood-control project protecting 149,000 acres of agricultural and timber lands. Work was started on this project in 1938. It was cut from \$120,000 to zero.

Lower Arkansas River, north bank. Levee protection affecting 568,000 acres. The project was under way last year and is under way this fiscal year. Cut from \$3,033,000 to \$500,000, making it impossible to start additional work and only possible to finish three jobs now under way.

Yazoo River Basin, Greenwood, Miss. A local protection project protecting a community of 18,061 people. Includes levees and pumping stations. Work was under way last year and is under way this fiscal year. The budget cut was from \$2,356,000 to zero.

Belzoni, Miss., population 4,071. Authorized in 1936. The budget cut was from \$337,000 to zero.

Sunflower River, Miss. Flood-control channels. Last work was done in calendar year 1948. Three hundred and eighty-one thousand acres affected. Cut from \$660,000 to zero.

Steele Bayou, Miss. Flood-control channels, affecting 281,000 acres. Work was under way last year and work is under way this fiscal year. Cut from \$555,000 to zero, making it impossible to do any more work, rendering the project incomplete.

Lake Pontchartrain, La. Levees for protecting a fast-growing urban area containing by a 1950 count approximately 17,000 homes and 50,000 people. An additional authorization was contained in the 1950 act. Work was under way last year under the old project and

is being continued for fiscal year 1952. Project cut from \$940,000 to zero, making it impossible to do any work under the new authorization.

I would like the committee to tell me why the budget reduced the lower Mississippi and its tributaries from \$119,238,000 to \$60,520,000. Does the chairman have that information? Evidently silence indicates he is without that information.

May I direct to the attention of the committee that of the appropriation of \$60,500,000 made for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries last year, the anticipated unobligated balance as of June 30 this year will be only \$280,000. This amount is not sufficient to meet one payroll, because there are approximately 5,415 employees.

I direct to the attention of the committee that the budget has reduced this project by almost 100 percent. In the event there is an amendment to cut it any further, you will understand that the Bureau of the Budget has already cut the project by almost 100 percent, and they have eliminated many important projects.

I think the members of the committee who inspected the projects in the lower Mississippi and its tributaries will vouch for the statement that General Feringa, president, Mississippi River Commission, is doing a good job, and he is not wasting money. Any amount the lower Mississippi and its tributaries is cut will certainly cost the taxpayers additional money in the future.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask my colleague, because he is on the committee, this question. When you refer to the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for appropriation purposes, you do not refer to the Red River, do you?

Mr. PASSMAN. No, we do not refer to the Red River. It includes the Red River backwater area, but not the Red River proper.

Mr. BROOKS. The Red River is not considered a part of the Mississippi and its tributaries for appropriation purposes?

Mr. PASSMAN. Not the upper stretches—that is my understanding.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mrs. BOSONE. I am pleased to hear what the gentleman is saying at this time. When the reclamation bill was before the House, just last week, we had about the same argument as you are giving today on the flood-control bill. There is no difference in my opinion as to the cost of taking water off the land and putting water on the land. The problem is taking the water off the land in the South, while the problem is putting the water on the land in the West. We advanced the same arguments and we were left with greatly cut budgets in the West. With a no-start policy I am afraid of the net result in national defense where I come from, where we have the great Hill Field Air Force Base, and one of the greatest depots for the Army,

tremendous Navy base, and an arsenal. We are surrounded by military activity, and yet we may drill and have drilled and found chlorides in the water and brackish water. We need water, and yet with this policy, and with the cuts by the Bureau of Reclamation itself, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Appropriations Committee, we have been cut drastically. I am fearful of the results. So the same arguments that you are using for the projects in the South can certainly be applied to the projects in the West. But, I did not see too many of you voting with the reclamation group. In fact, further amendments to cut were offered to our western reclamation act by some Members of the South. I want to impress the Members of the House today that the argument is the same in the West so far as putting water on the land, as it is in the South where they need to take water off the land.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. We must remember that when the water comes down into the lower valley, it is not unusual to have a quarter or possibly half a billion dollars of losses in one year alone, in addition to the loss of many lives.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I simply wanted to comment with respect to the lower Mississippi, that the policy which the Interior Subcommittee followed in not permitting new starts in the West, which the gentleman from Utah was so greatly concerned about, has been entirely consistent with what the subcommittee has done with reference to the lower Mississippi Valley. None of the \$60,000,000 referred to contains any new projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Not only does the recommendation of the committee not contain any new projects, but the budget has eliminated many projects now under construction. I wanted the committee to know that the budget had made a \$59,268,000 reduction below the request of the Corps of Army Engineers, which is almost half.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Is it not true that the amount the Bureau of the Budget cut the estimates will have to come off the construction end of these projects because the maintenance must go on just the same, and therefore there has been little left for even the construction of projects which were started years and years ago?

Mr. PASSMAN. In every case that is true because the maintenance must be continued regardless of the appropriation. When an appropriation is made, the maintenance is first considered, and if anything remains, it goes to continue the projects under construction.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. With respect to the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, as has been so well pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from

Louisiana, who is a very valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Budget Bureau itself cut that recommendation of the engineers practically one-half, did it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly then, any thought of any further reduction would be a serious mistake, would it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. I agree with the gentleman, and that is why I wanted to direct the attention of the committee to this statement. You will find it on page 240 in part I of the hearings.

If you will read that you will understand as I do that the Bureau of the Budget has cut the request of the Corps of Army Engineers almost in half.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I understand the problem which my colleagues have faced in reporting this bill and I know its magnitude would baffle many citizens.

However, I think that I owe it to the membership of the House to lay before them a record of how the cuts in the civil functions projects scheduled for the Columbia River Basin will affect the civilian economy and the national defense.

I believe that before this bill is ready for signature by the President additional information and further discussion will reveal that some amendments to the bill as now reported will be required.

In connection with the items in the bill for the Pacific Northwest, let me point out that the President requested \$5,000,000 to undertake the beginning of construction of Ice Harbor Dam on the lower river. The Snake is one of the three principal tributaries of the Columbia.

The House committee has eliminated this appropriation in its entirety. This means that the Ice Harbor Dam power production will be delayed for at least one year—from 1956 to 1957.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I must advise you that this delay jeopardizes the operation of the Hanford Works. The Ice Harbor dam is but a few miles southeast of Hanford.

Hanford now is solely dependent for electric power upon a single line of supply which comes to it from Grand Coulee Dam, more than 100 miles away. The Hanford Works must have a continuous and large supply of power. Any interruption in power service has serious consequences; yet Hanford is wholly dependent upon one supply line and this supply line is part of a transmission system which, due to heavy growth in power demand over all the Pacific Northwest, is already badly overloaded at times and, as a consequence, not too stable in its service.

Under its expanded program, details of which I am not at liberty to give you, the Hanford Works will require not only additional power supplies over and above that which it now receives, but, for safety's sake, it should have an additional source of power—a supply which will

come to it from a different direction and from a plant which can be independent of all other sources.

Ice Harbor Dam is justified in considerable measure on this single basis.

If Ice Harbor Dam is not built for this purpose it is quite probable that the Atomic Energy Commission in order to get an additional source of power will insist on spending approximately \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 for a steam plant which must import fuel from other regions at considerable expense and at continuing higher costs.

Thus, failure to approve the beginning of construction of Ice Harbor Dam will not necessarily mean a saving of money. It will mean simply a less efficient use of money to supply power in some other way.

Ice Harbor Dam will pay for itself many times over during the long pull whether or not the Hanford power use continues to exist.

Ice Harbor is a multipurpose dam. It is wholly feasible on a payout basis. It is the logical dam to be undertaken next in Columbia River development, and it will supplement and complement the other multipurpose dams now built or to be built on the Columbia River system.

Department of the Interior files and the hearings before the committee both show records of the Atomic Energy Commission's need for this dam.

Notwithstanding this, the committee disallowed funds for it on the basis that its members had not received clear-cut information relative to the protection of fisheries during and after construction of this project.

I am inclined to agree with the committee that the information received was not adequate. However, I believe adequate information on this matter, which can satisfy committee members and other members of this House, will be forthcoming in the next few weeks. I have talked with the Department of the Interior about this since Interior is the Department responsible for fisheries conservation. It is my hope that an adequate record on this point can be made before the Senate.

If this is done, I also hope that the House will not again turn a deaf ear toward the support of this project.

The committee has recommended other cuts in funds for projects on the Columbia River system which, it seems to me and my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, may have deeply serious consequences if they are allowed to remain in effect.

The President recommended an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to continue the work of construction on Chief Joseph Dam, located on the Columbia River in north central Washington.

Through the fiscal year 1952 the Congress has appropriated the total of \$43,592,800 for the construction of this project. The work is well under way. The dam has been scheduled to come into power production in 1956 at a time when the need for power in the Pacific Northwest will still be critical. When complete, the dam will produce nearly 1,000,000 kilowatts of prime electricity. It is centrally located in the Pacific Northwest and the cost of transmitting

the power from the damsite to market is relatively low.

Failure to complete this dam on schedule will result in an intensification of the over-all power shortage which now exists in the Pacific Northwest, to the detriment of industrial expansion.

The committee cut from the estimate of \$25,300,000 to \$11,500,000, it seems to me, is unnecessarily drastic.

I am hopeful, here, too, that further consideration of the facts prior to final passage of this bill by both Houses will result in at least a partial restoration of these funds for Chief Joseph. If this cut is permitted to stand, power production from Chief Joseph will be delayed at least 6 months and the delay will come during the critical season of the year when water flows in the river are low. This may result in curtailment of aluminum production in the Pacific Northwest and the curtailment possibly of other defense production.

Finally, I want to comment on the committee's complete disallowance of all funds for the continued construction of the Dalles Dam.

The President requested \$37,500,000 to accelerate construction of this dam under way during the fiscal year 1953. Work has already begun this spring under last year's initial appropriation of \$4,000,000.

The House committee has disallowed the entire amount of \$37,500,000, which brings the schedule on this dam to a complete standstill.

The Dalles Dam was scheduled to come into power production in 1957. Failure to restore at least some of the funds requested will delay this schedule by at least 1 year.

Delay in the power production from this dam and the Chief Joseph Dam will intensify the risk which the Northwest runs each winter during low water season—the risk of having to curtail valuable light metal and defense chemical production.

If these money cuts on Ice Harbor, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles were not so great, they might be kept on the construction schedule recommended by the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Administration.

If maintained on this schedule, the three dams would be contributing, among them, a total of 964,000 kilowatts of prime power during the low-water season in the winter of 1957–58.

This would provide a small surplus of power supply over the known demands of that year—a surplus which could be made available for industrial development and which would supply reasonable reserves of generation with which to meet service contingencies.

But if these reductions recommended by the committee are allowed to stand, the three dams will be delayed.

The margin of power supply over demand over the region will be materially reduced in the years following 1956; and, in fact, under certain water conditions, will be nonexistent with a resulting danger of power-use rationing and curtailment.

Now I realize that the Congress is faced with many demands for flood control, rivers and harbors projects through-

out the country and that there is great difficulty experienced in appropriating any especially large sums for any single section of the country when all sections are demanding attention.

During the present decade, however, the annual capital investment by the Federal Government in the Columbia River will, of necessity, be large.

In order to keep up with its requirements for power, the Columbia River region must bring in about 400,000 kilowatts of new generation each year for the next few years; and this, of course, seems like a lot of expenditure for a single region of the country.

However, one paramount fact must be borne in mind.

Unlike many other flood control and rivers and harbors projects in other parts of the country, the Columbia River projects are all of them heavy revenue producers.

All of them will manufacture great quantities of hydroelectric power, which, because of the rapidly expanding economy, has a ready market.

During the past year, revenues from the sale of power from existing Columbia River projects returned to the Treasury a total of more than \$36,000,000.

It must be remembered that this money not only covers interest on the Federal investment, depreciation, all operations, and maintenance expense, but, in addition, returns a substantial surplus to the Treasury each year.

On a payout basis—that is, on the basis of paying back the investment with interest—these Columbia River projects are well ahead of schedule.

These appropriations are not "money down the drain" in any sense; they are reimbursable.

In its 12 years of power sales, this Columbia River program has returned to the Federal Treasury nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in gross revenues. Let me repeat that—a quarter of a billion dollars.

Necessary as budget cuts are—important as it is to balance the expenditures in one region against the expenditures in another—I believe it is necessary for the Members of this House to exercise their very best judgment in administering such budget cuts.

Projects such as those on the Columbia River, which return so much of their cost with interest to the Federal Treasury, and which, even beyond this, provide the tools for a rapidly expanding free private enterprise production which broadens the tax base and improves employment—projects of this nature should receive a high priority of consideration.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the beautiful Ohio River runs along my district for about 175 miles. Naturally, I am very much interested in any and all legislation that has to do with the improvement of rivers and harbors and with flood control. I have participated actively in the consideration of this kind of legislation ever since I have been a Member of Congress. I have often said that the most important thing in the

Ohio Valley is the Ohio River. It is a well-known fact that under our basic law, the Federal Government has full control over all of the navigable rivers of the Nation. This is an incident of sovereignty and it should be thus.

I was very active in the consideration and passage of flood-control legislation immediately following the big flood of 1937. Congressman WILL WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, and I were probably more instrumental than any other two Congressmen in the passage of legislation that provided for the construction of flood walls and flood defenses. It would have been impossible to have had passed legislation that would provide for the construction of flood walls all along all of the rivers of the Nation at Government expense. Therefore, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and I and others interested, decided that we would try for the passage of legislation that would provide for construction of flood walls upon condition that the municipalities involved would participate in the payment of these expenses by providing for rights-of-way that would be necessary for the construction of proposed flood walls.

This legislation passed the Congress and a few projects have been built by reason thereof. For instance, there is a flood wall around the city of Huntington, W. Va., which has cost the city and State hundreds of thousands of dollars for rights-of-way. The Government no doubt has spent several million dollars in the construction of the flood walls there. In the city of Ironton, Ohio, the people voted upon themselves a bond issue of about \$750,000 and the Government came forward with about three or four million dollars and the first flood wall under the provisions of that law was constructed in Ironton, Ohio. The law requires that the cities maintain the projects and, since the construction of the flood wall at Ironton, the city has spent thousands of dollars. Last fall the people of the city of Ironton voted upon themselves another bond issue which I think was something more than \$100,000. This is to take care of a serious threat that has come by reason of subterranean waters.

The city of Pomeroy, Ohio, is located on the Ohio River and is in my district. It is a county-seat town and is rather unfortunately located in that it has a long river frontage and most of the city was inundated by the big floods of 1913 and 1937. The recent flood of this year, which was not considered as one of the heavy floods, inundated a portion of the city. The city has constructed a parking lot along the river front and this parking lot naturally takes the brunt of any of the floods that get out of bounds.

The recent flood developed some conditions in Pomeroy which need attention. To this end, I asked the Army engineers to make an investigation of the situation in Pomeroy. The headquarters of the Army engineers for our section of the river are located at Huntington, W. Va., which is about 50 miles below Pomeroy. At my suggestion the chief of the Army engineers in Huntington made a tour of inspection of the

Pomeroy situation. I know, and as has already been brought out in the discussions this afternoon, that the funds allotted to the Army engineers for investigation purposes have been curtailed and limited very severely. Personally, I think it is not an extravagance to permit this splendid corps of expert engineers to do whatever is necessary to protect the best interests of the people and at the same time to improve navigation on the river. In an effort to bring relief to the Pomeroy situation, I have introduced a bill, which is known as H. R. 6529. That bill is as follows:

A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Ohio River in the vicinity of Pomeroy, Ohio

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey of the Ohio River at and in the vicinity of Pomeroy, Ohio, with a view to ascertaining as near as can be ascertained the exact damages caused by the construction of the Gallipolis locks and dam in the Ohio River by seepage and drainage and backwater resulting from the raising of the water level by the construction of said dam, and with a view of constructing works to protect against further continuance and recurrence of such damage; and with a view of reimbursing local interests for damages already suffered in said locality.

I hope that I may be able to induce the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control to recommend the passage of this bill so that the Army engineers may be permitted to make a survey of the whole situation in the Pomeroy vicinity.

I have voted against all extravagant spending, especially the spending of money abroad to improve rivers and harbors over there. As it has been brought out here this afternoon, I think it is not economy to permit our people to suffer for the lack of funds to give them protection, while we, with great prodigality, send millions abroad:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the overall details of this bill have been explained adequately by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kerr], the chairman of our subcommittee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis]. Both have given you in general what the subcommittee has done with reference to the budget request.

Needless to say, in my judgment, this is a good bill. It is a bill which our subcommittee can defend in good conscience.

I wish to pay tribute to my colleagues on the committee. It has been a most harmonious committee to work with and a most diligent committee in its long and complicated hearings. The same goes for the able staff members.

Also, in my judgment the witnesses who appeared before the committee did a very fine job in their presentations. We had before us the Army Corps of Engineers. We had before us the officials of the Quartermaster Corps, who have charge of national cemeteries. We had the Governor of the Panama Canal

and a number of his staff. Although the subcommittee did not agree with all of the recommendations of those witnesses, I think our subcommittee has the highest respect for the ability of those who submitted the items and the presentations which were made.

I should also add that our subcommittee had over 400 witnesses from the outside, who came from all parts of this country to argue on behalf of their individual projects. We had over 120 Members of Congress appear before the subcommittee, all of them sincerely and honestly interested in various projects in their districts.

Our subcommittee did its best work under most adverse circumstances, for, obviously, the country does need development continued which was started many long years ago, in preserving and expanding our national resources.

There is one point that should be brought out at the very outset. This bill is called the civil-functions bill. The major portion of the money included in the bill is for river and harbor and flood control development. At least, that is what history tells us it should be. In this case, at least in this bill in my judgment, we are perverting the original intent and function of this bill. Let me give you an explanation of why I feel that way.

In the river and harbor portion of the budget there were 26 projects set forth. Ten of those projects took up in the budget 88 percent of the requested funds. Ten of the originally included 26 projects in the budget take up 88 percent of the requested funds.

In the flood control section of the bill the picture is equally bad. There were 64 projects set forth in the flood control part of the budget. Seventeen of those 64 projects took up 77 percent in dollars requested in the budget.

In my judgment this bill as presented by the budget and by the President is a perversion of the original intent of Congress in the basic legislation. In effect, we are getting our hydroelectric power development at the expense of flood control and at the expense of river and harbor development; we are achieving electric-power development by a subterfuge, and as a result many worth while, many highly desirable flood-control projects and river and harbor-development projects are being sidetracked.

I am not stating that we should not have hydroelectric-development projects, but I am saying that we should come out in the open and say certain appropriations are intended for a hydroelectric-power dam and not use flood control and river and harbor development as a subterfuge.

I know there are many Members in this Chamber who feel that this action by the committee cutting the bill 29 percent halts a great deal of desirable and legitimate American development of our natural resources. I cannot deny that we have to a degree stopped some Nation-wide developments; as a matter of fact, the record shows that by the subcommittee action we have knocked out of the budget as presented by the Presi-

dent six river and harbor projects entirely. The record shows that our subcommittee deleted from the flood-control portion of the budget nine projects. In other words, there are 15 projects which do not appear in this bill, which have been deleted entirely from the President's budget. I know that the people interested in those projects feel that we have halted the legitimate and desirable development of parts of the United States by this action. That brings up a point which I would like to make.

There is a magazine in the State of Michigan, my State, called *Inside Michigan*. The March issue carried an article which provoked, I might say, considerable conversation in the State of Michigan. I am sure that if every Member of this body read it he would also feel perhaps that the Congress in the last 3 or 4 years has not acted too wisely in some respects in the appropriation of funds and in the expansion of some programs.

The headline of this article reads:

Congress spends billions for French seaways—but not one cent for our own St. Lawrence project.

Let me at the outset disassociate the St. Lawrence project from this discussion. I am interested in that project, many people are, but I am not using this article for the promotion of that project; I am, however, talking about the over-all problem of development of the United States. The article does make a good point in that regard.

I quote from the article as follows:

The taxpayers of the United States are building two vast inland waterways and power projects in the rugged, submarginal French Alps which will cost untold billions—billions, not millions—of dollars before they are completed.

Not 1 cent of this cost will ever be returned to this country.

I drop down now to another statement as follows:

Financing of these two tremendous projects in France was agreed upon without ever holding so much as a congressional hearing.

Let us take another quotation from the article:

There are 22 dams and 46 power stations for development in the French project—three are now under construction or completed. The total cost for just these three phases of the work is \$685,500,000.

Quoting from another part of the article:

What will be the total cost of the Rhone River Valley project? Your guess is as good as any Frenchman's. In fact, no Frenchman to date has had the courage to hazard even a calculated guess. No one knows. There are, however, some estimates as to the cost of only 3 of 46 sites for development. These three are now under construction or completed. The previously mentioned Genissiat portion is expected to cost \$314,200,000. The Donzere-Mondragon section will be completed at a cost of \$228,500,000, while the third project known as Montelmar will cost but a petty \$142,800,000. The total comes to some \$685,500,000. In 1950, 90 percent of the funds expended on the Rhone River Valley development were supplied by the Marshall plan. It is obvious that the total cost of the entire program will run well over \$1,000,000,000.

Here is the final paragraph or two of this article:

What we do want to argue is this:

If we continue to squander our resources on overseas projects, continue to neglect equally important, if not more important ventures of this Nation, all democracy will ultimately pay the price of our neglect and lack of foresight.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is vital to the United States and Canada both from the standpoint of economical development and for military strength. It is time our Congress and administration leaders realized that the economic well being and military strength of this hemisphere is equally as important to the forces of democracy as strength in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to bring up another problem. While I was preparing my remarks on this bill, I thought it might be well to see State by State how the bill would affect each State, how much money from the bill would go into each State. I have the figures here.

I come from the State of Michigan. There is not a single penny set forth for the State of Michigan in either the river, harbor or flood control portion of the bill except a limited amount for maintenance of existing harbors.

I want to say, however, that the members of this committee are cognizant of the problems that face all the areas of the United States. We appreciate the dangers that exist in the lower Mississippi Valley, we are appreciative of the need for power and flood control in the Northwest, we understand the need for development of the intracoastal waterway in the Gulf area and up the eastern seaboard. Our committee is not at all parochial, our committee is not sectional; but I do want to call the attention of the Members to a problem which we do face in the Middle West, not only in the State of Michigan. There are five Great Lakes in that area. There are many millions of people who live in the area of the Great Lakes.

Lakes Huron, Erie, Michigan, Superior, and Ontario do not overflow like the Mississippi River does, but they fluctuate in their water level. The Great Lakes in the 1930's were at a very low ebb. At the present time the Great Lakes are in a serious condition because of a very high water level.

Those who read Time magazine saw an article on page 25 of last week's issue which was entitled "The Great Lakes Creeping Calamity." This article points out that in the State of Michigan alone the damage from high water will total over a billion dollars. There are seven other States on the Great Lakes and I do not know how much damage will be caused in those States. Let me emphasize, however, in Michigan alone the damage from high water is a billion dollars. The people in those areas have not yet received any assistance in any way whatsoever from any agency of the Federal Government for the handling of this problem.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] at this point for a comment or two which I think he will make.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has put his finger on an extremely serious problem facing all of the Great Lakes area. In the particular area that I represent, which borders on the southern shores of Lake Ontario, we have suffered very, very serious damage already from the high water levels, and it is anticipated that the situation may get worse before it gets better. The same is true all along the lake shore. We have been endeavoring, as I know the gentleman has, to get some action from the Department of State and the Department of the Army, and a formal reference of this problem to the International Joint Commission set up between Canada and this country to handle these problems and problems of similar nature. To date we have not been able to get the State Department to refer this matter unilaterally to the International Joint Commission. They take the position that they cannot do so unless they have the consent of Canada.

The International Joint Commission is meeting here in Washington this week. The meetings start today and they are to terminate on Friday. The gentleman from Michigan now addressing us, and myself, together with the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERAG], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]—

Mr. REED of New York. I am interested in that also—

Mr. KEATING. Have prepared a telegram in which we would be very happy to have any others join, which is addressed to the members of the International Joint Commission. It goes over the head of the State Department, which has been unwilling to take action to meet this problem. It is regrettable that this action seems to be necessary but I see no alternative. We cannot allow this deplorable condition to continue without taking every step within our power to alleviate the conditions. The telegram is short and reads as follows.

Mr. FORD. May I make this suggestion? The gentleman from New York might announce that if there are any Members of the House who would like to join in this joint telegram, that it would be well to have as many as possible sign it.

Mr. KEATING. I quite agree, and I would be very anxious to have as many as possible join as cosigners. Let me read it. It is short. It is addressed, I repeat, to the members of the International Joint Commission, and will probably be sent to them individually or to the chairmen of the United States and Canadian sections:

The critical situation in the Great Lakes Basin resulting from the abnormally high lake level requires immediate attention. Because of the extensive damage that has already taken place and the still greater destruction which is bound to occur this year with the increasingly high lake levels, the International Joint Commission has the responsibility to consider this serious matter and possible remedial action on its agenda during its meeting now being held in the city of Washington. We, therefore, specifically request that the International Joint Commission during its present session undertake the consideration of the problem

and forthwith recommend any and all remedial action for the alleviation of the dangers to the affected areas. Kindly advise us, if possible by return wire, when we and others interested can meet with your Commission to discuss this urgent problem.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. BOLTON. The situation along the coast of Lake Erie is very serious. I, too, have been making every possible effort to get some action, but have been unable to. I hope I may join with the other Members in this telegram.

Mr. KEATING. We would be very happy to have the gentlewoman join with us.

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

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

Mr. POTTER. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] on the action he has taken. He is one of the first Members of Congress to be conscious of this problem. It happens that if the height of the Lakes increases as much next year as it increased this year, the damage will run into the billions of dollars and will make the flood damage of the Missouri look like that caused by a small pond in comparison. I sincerely hope some effort will or can be made in an effort to alleviate this problem. Has the Corps of Engineers made any survey of this problem?

Mr. FORD. The Corps of Engineers as the result of a resolution approved by the Committee on Public Works about 10 days ago is undertaking a preliminary survey of the damage and all possible remedies for this situation. The Corps of Engineers has promised me that that report will be published by the middle of May or thereabouts. The report should be helpful to those who are interested in this problem. However, I believe the action which has been indicated by the gentleman from New York is also highly desirable because the International Joint Commission has charge of all problems relating to the Great Lakes. It is made up of three members from Canada and three members from the United States. They have charge, for example, of whether or not a stream up in Ontario, the Ogoki, can continue to be diverted into Lake Superior. During World War II they changed the course of that stream so that instead of flowing into the Hudson Bay area it now flows into Lake Superior, adding to the amount of water that now goes into Lake Superior and down through all the other Lakes. The International Joint Commission has authority to reverse its previous position if it wants to but, as the gentleman from New York and others have found, the Department of State refuses to permit even the discussion of this problem by the International Joint Commission.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman on bringing this problem before the House at this time.

I believe that in addition to the International Commission, however, some attention should be given to the possibility of bringing the water through the Chicago River and the Illinois River down into the Mississippi. I have made inquiry of the Corps of Engineers and have learned that as a result of the Supreme Court decision that was entered some years ago they feel their hands are bound and that they are prevented from taking steps to increase the flow of water into the Illinois River and the Mississippi because of that decision. Is there not a possibility of the States bordering the Great Lakes getting together looking to changing that decision in order to take care of the problem at this time?

Mr. FORD. I have looked into this situation. It is a legal one, as the gentleman himself probably knows. I understand the only way that decision of the United States Supreme Court can be overcome is by a resolution of the Congress. There have been several resolutions introduced to my knowledge, but no action has been taken on them. I would be delighted to join with the gentleman from Illinois in trying to push for action on that type of proposal.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. First of all, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his initiative in this problem. As he knows, I have lived with this problem for some time. I would like to have the Record show in the discussion of this matter that these diversions into Lake Superior are not the result of an authority exercised by the International Joint Commission. These diversions were granted by the State Department. As I understand it, the International Joint Commission to whom we are referring this telegram, has no authority or jurisdiction in any matter of this nature except by way of a reference from either the United States or Canada or both. The only way we can attack this serious problem is to recognize that these high waters are of international concern, and the International Joint Commission is an international agency, consequently it is the proper means by which this problem can be considered. But, our great problem is the fact that the Canadian Government is unwilling to make this reference to the International Joint Commission and they are unwilling to act. There is Gut Dam in the St. Lawrence River near Ogdensburg, and there are the diversions into Lake Superior, namely the Long Lac and Ogaki Rivers, and there is also the so-called Chicago Drainage Canal which can be dealt with almost immediately by the International Joint Commission, if we can obtain this necessary reference. If the House Committee on Foreign Affairs would only take action on a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 179—which requests this reference by virtue of a resolution to be adopted by the Congress, we would then be in a position to bring about action to relieve this disastrous situation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter up on the floor. The northern part of my district fronts on Lake Erie. I have been collecting a mass of information, and have written to my people that this was an international problem. But, the tragic part of it is that people have built their houses back from the beach a distance that they thought would be perfectly safe, and they built up walls to protect them. This high level of water, when the heavy winds have come, has destroyed these concrete walls and then washed away their houses. The property has been damaged terrifically. Sooner or later, the Congress, I think, ought to step in and defray the expenses for restoring their property. We do it in some other instances, and we even do it abroad. I believe they should have some help. They are in a desperate plight. They have made their investments there. Some of them live in Buffalo, and have built their homes out there in my district. But, I want to raise the point in regard to this high level of the lake. I have lived near Lake Erie ever since I was born. My people were navigators and old masters of ships. There were several generations of them. They told me that the water rises to a high point every 7 years, and then goes down. I have watched a large rock, from which we used to dive and swim, and during my boyhood I have seen the water level come up to the top of that stone so that you could not see the rock, and then go down so low that you could walk to that stone without wetting your feet. That is a problem that is worth looking into and checking in regard to the causes of this rise and fall of the lake waters. I thank the gentleman and I join wholeheartedly with him in this move to do something to remedy this situation.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I was very much interested in the comments of the gentleman from Michigan concerning the worthy, domestic flood-control projects, which were being crowded out of this and similar bills—hydroelectric power projects and things of that kind, and also the gentleman's comments upon the many billions of dollars that are going to Europe. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan who is it that controls the policy of these appropriations? Is it the Budget Director or does the Congress of the United States control the policy?

Mr. FORD. In reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN], I will say that at least during the present situation our subcommittee, wisely or unwisely, felt that we had to initially stand by the budget. That was the basic criterion. I do not mean to say that the Congress should never in this bill go over and beyond what the budget has recommended, but certainly at the present time, when we are faced with a \$14,000,000,000 deficit in the budget for the next fiscal year, I do not believe that our subcommittee could in good conscience go beyond the budget recommendation in this particular item.

Mr. GOLDEN. The gentleman from Michigan knows there are many worth while, justifiable flood-control projects in America that are being denied by the Budget Director, that have been approved and are feasible, where untold millions of dollars of damage is being inflicted on the American people in various communities every year. Many Members of Congress are vitally interested in those things. We hope that this committee will soon, if necessary, take the reins in their own hands and lay down a policy to protect the American people and allow some of these worth while domestic flood-control projects to have some Federal assistance, rather than to put the entire emphasis on some European project or some hydroelectric-power projects.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 3 years I have been speaking to Members of Congress, going before the Appropriations Committee in charge of flood control, and endeavoring to obtain Federal funds with which to build flood control projects at Middlesboro, Pineville, and Barbourville, Ky., on the Cumberland River.

Each time I have been met, as all other Members of Congress have, with the proposition that no new flood control projects are to be started in the United States during the present emergency. Yet while this is true, we Members of Congress know that this present fair deal administration is pouring out billions of dollars under the Marshall plan and aid to Europe, and you have just heard the gentleman from Michigan state that a large part of these funds are being used in France, Switzerland, and other nations for flood control projects.

I should think it would be hard for this administration to justify before the American people the position that they occupy when they are willing to spend billions of dollars in foreign lands of the American taxpayers' money and at the same time lay down a policy that prohibits and prevents the starting of any new worthy, justifiable flood control projects here in our own homeland to benefit and protect the American people.

For the past 3 years, since I have been in Congress, this honorable committee has allowed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to dictate the policy where the public funds of this Nation shall be spent. In my opinion, the Congress of the United States ought to recover the power to control the public purse and it should not be delegated to any executive department of the Government. In the report written by the committee to support the present bill, it is stated that no new projects for flood control are included in the next fiscal year. Yet we have been called at this session of Congress and we will be called on again to pour out many billions of dollars to Europe for all sorts of projects that the American taxpayers are supporting over there. This policy should be changed. The American people

ple should come first. If there is not sufficient Federal money to spread all over the face of the earth, what money we do have should first be spent in America.

Almost every year these three American towns which I have mentioned above are flooded by the Cumberland River. Hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages are inflicted upon our people. For weeks after one of these devastating floods hits this section, the whole community is paralyzed. All industry stops. These communities contribute their full share to the war effort and to the defense plants. They are producing large quantities of bituminous coal and much-needed electricity and hardwood timber. In this section alone each year, from eighteen to twenty-five million tons of bituminous coal goes into the factories and war plants of this Nation, and the Kentucky Utility Co., located on the Cumberland River 4 miles below Pineville, Ky., has a direct high tension power line going into the atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and it does furnish vital electricity to many other essential defense plants in the Tennessee Valley.

These communities have complied with every request of the Government to raise their portion of the expense of these flood-protection projects. All the while that we are waiting and extravagantly spending our money abroad, the American people in this section are suffering almost every year repeated flood damage.

I call upon the Members of Congress to change the policy and to assert themselves and to be no longer dominated and controlled by any executive department of Government. It is time that these worthy projects and many other worthy flood-control projects in the United States should receive immediate attention. If we maintain our national strength and continue to produce the necessary goods for war and peace, we must protect the American people first, and I shall be glad to see the day when this great committee realizes its first duty is to the American people.

It has long been the policy of the Congress to help local communities with their flood-control projects. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan pointed out a few moments ago while speaking to the Congress that the largest part of the present appropriation was going for the creation of hydroelectric power and that only a small part of the funds appropriated this year were being placed in flood-control projects and that those projects have already been started and need to be completed. I agree with him that this is a disguise and subterfuge. The primary function of the Congress in this particular is to protect American towns and communities from flood damage. Electric power and energy can be created by private enterprise and by the investment of private moneys, but if communities are to receive protection from the devastation of floods, they must have Federal aid.

I urge this committee and all Members of Congress to change the policy and to control it and to get back to the

original American policy of building worthy flood-control projects here in America before we waste all of our national substance abroad.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to refer to page 2 of the report. There is one sentence in the third paragraph which disturbs this Member at least. It reads:

It is obvious to the committee that these facts point out a vital need for a comprehensive and coordinated program for the development of the water resources of the Nation.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In my State we have been resisting the idea of what is called out there the Columbia Valley Authority. There are nine other parts of the Nation that go by some other name. Did your committee have in mind by any chance recommending not only to the Congress but to the Corps of Engineers, and to everybody else, the valley authority type of thing before further appropriations are made?

Mr. FORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] that that sentence does not in any way whatsoever infer a recommendation for the Columbia Valley Authority. The question of the Columbia Valley Authority was never discussed in our subcommittee. I think that sentence means precisely what it says. There is no implication of any sort that we are recommending a Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If I may take just a minute more, the word "program" in the sentence is what bothered me. I believe I understand what the committee had in mind, but I was a little disturbed over the potentiality of the word itself. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA. Pursuing the comments that have been made by the gentleman from Colorado and also the gentleman from Kentucky, I think it is very critical in this bill, where there was some \$1,600,000 requested for preliminary surveys and only \$1,215,000 allowed, and this involves the very basic need that we have of getting these preliminary surveys. The only ones who can make those surveys are the United States Army engineers. We cannot get an estimate of what we need in the way of flood control until we get those surveys. It is most critical to some because our people just cannot understand when we get through and say, "Well, we didn't get the money for that survey." Perhaps that is not important to some but I think it is most important when the people of this country are getting flooded out of their homes, millions of dollars of damage being done, and we cannot reach the basic step of

getting a little preliminary survey of \$20,000 or \$25,000.

Mr. FORD. At this point I would like to make a statement that is important. Our committee did consider the \$1,600,000 request by the Army engineers for flood-control surveys.

I do not know how many Members of the House and Senate know how much of a backlog we have in surveys, or how many surveys are on the shelves where no construction has been undertaken. It is my recollection that the Corps of Engineers have in surveys where there has been no construction about \$600,000,000,000 worth of flood control and river and harbor projects.

Mr. DONDERO. It is \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] tells me it is \$8,000,000,000. In other words, you have \$8,000,000,000 worth of projects that have gone only to the survey stage. Our committee, however, is being condemned because we have refused to give you another \$1,600,000 to put more surveys on the shelf. Just how much sense does it make to add to those that are on the shelves over in the office of the Corps of Engineers. It does not make a bit of sense in my judgment.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. For the information of the gentleman in regard to the Natchitoches project, General Chorpene—who is in charge of civil functions—General Chorpene said that this project apparently was recommended by the engineers, recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and he said:

It will be 60 percent completed when the funds received this year are used and will be 89 percent completed with the funds which we are asking for 1953.

A project being that close to completion and no funds being allowed in the bill at all—I do not quarrel with the committee about the size of the bill, but I say that there might have been a better distribution of funds. If the gentleman has an explanation in reference to that I would like very much for him to put it in the Record.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Natchitoches project—I have not finished my prepared statement so when I have answered the gentleman from Louisiana I must refuse to yield further for I must spend a little time on my own comments. I have been very willing and glad to have interruptions, but I need a certain minimum time in which to develop my own statement.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has been very generous in yielding to others.

Mr. FORD. The Natchitoches project was not included in the President's budget last year. It was started in 1941, started back in the early days of World War II. Construction was stopped during World War II. It was initiated last year following the resolving of certain problems down in Louisiana which had to do with the acquisition of lands, right-of-way, or something of that sort. The money they got last year will be used to initiate a contract which will be let sometime in April of 1952. That contract will

continue for a period of time, probably almost a year, which means that our committee felt there did not have to be any more funds appropriated in fiscal 1953 for the completion of that contract.

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Was the same test applied to every project? I realize that our flood-control appropriation bill was passed very late last year, but was the same test applied to every project there that if the money was not expended they did not get any more money?

Mr. FORD. We cut out a great many projects or scaled them down where they had large unexpended balances.

Our subcommittee had the Army engineers before them and at the time they came before us they on several occasions made requests for large funds for the construction of housing projects at these various dams and reservoirs. For example, the engineers requested \$1,812,000 for the construction of housing projects at Chief Joseph Dam. Included in the facilities at Chief Joseph are 20 two-bedroom homes at a cost of \$8,000.

All through the budget presentations you will find funds for the construction of housing facilities for people who live and work in the areas. I must admit that you have to build some housing facilities at Government expense for the use of these people who live near these projects and work there, but I do not agree under any circumstances with a policy which prohibits the Federal Government from getting its money back through the rental of these projects.

I have several charts based on information which came from the Corps of Engineers that presents a very serious situation. Here is a typical example involving the Columbia River: A five-room apartment, three bedrooms, four units, living quarters in each unit, built in 1949 at a cost of \$15,990, present value \$12,400. The occupant of that dwelling unit, for example, in 1951 earned a salary of \$6,600 and he was paying \$40 a month rent.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Congress increased the salary of people who work for the Government last year. So this man who earned \$6,600 in 1951 now gets \$7,240. He still pays \$40 a month rent. It does not make sense.

I have a number of these illustrations, but I will only discuss one or two of them. It shows the utter stupidity of the past rental policy in effect under the politicians in the executive branch of the Government.

Here is one at Fall River: Six-room three-bedroom house, built in 1951 at a cost of \$16,500, present value \$16,500. The man who occupied it in 1951 earned a salary of \$5,800, paying \$40 a month rent. We increased his salary last year to \$6,340. He still pays \$40 a month rent.

I am sure there are many similar illustrations that prevail in every department of the Government, including the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force. Those in

authority have been getting away with murder in not bringing back to the Federal Treasury the amortized cost of the rental units. This means inevitably that every citizen of the United States is subsidizing the rent of these people who occupy these quarters. It is so easy for the people in the executive branch of the Government to not press this matter. In effect, as I said before, they are taking money from every taxpayer to pay the rent of these people who occupy the units.

These are not public housing projects. These are well constructed, very livable projects, and these tenants are fairly well paid.

It means more than a little money to the Federal Treasury. The Army engineers in the hearings, page 897 of the second part of the hearings, showed that in 1951 from the rental of projects under their jurisdiction alone they took in \$1,148,990. Actually, the Army engineers realize the seriousness of the situation and they want to raise the rent. They have agreed that in most cases the rental should be raised 100 percent, which means that if you do raise the rentals 100 percent \$1,148,990 additional will come into the Federal Treasury. This additional revenue will be a small pittance, yes, but it is money that should be justifiably paid in to the Federal Treasury.

I would like to turn to another department, the Quartermaster Corps.

The Quartermaster Corps operates the national cemeteries. They have housing facilities for the people who manage those properties. Let me give you just an example over here in Alexandria, Va. One of the supervisors is occupying a two-bedroom house. In 1952 he only paid \$332.50 for the use of those facilities. The Quartermaster Corps thought that was wrong, and they are ready to recommend an increase to \$666.80 a year.

Here, however, is the bad thing about the whole mess. Committees of the Congress have been trying to get this department to raise these rents so that the Government would get back its amortization cost. Now another bureaucrat comes along and he sticks his nose into the situation. Mr. Tighe Woods, as the result of a law passed by the Congress last year giving him authority to interfere with rent control, has told all agencies of the Federal Government that they cannot raise these rents without a maze of red tape and compounded bureaucracy of the worst sort. To me that is inexcusable and I, for one, intend to do everything I can to strike from the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the provision which gives Tighe Woods the authority to impose rent control on other Federal agencies. I would say from the record that the various Federal agencies themselves are the best rent administrators.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was not only surprised but greatly disturbed the other day, last Thursday, when I read in the report of the com-

mittee that the request for Cape Girardeau, Mo., has been denied. Especially was I surprised at some of the reasons that were given.

I want to commend the committee, of course, for its economy program and I expect to stand with this committee all the way through. I was interested in what the gentleman from Michigan said a minute ago that he did not feel that the committee had the good conscience to go beyond the recommendations of the Budget Director, yet I was disturbed when they cut out this item for Cape Girardeau for a flood-control project which did have Budget approval after being recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

I want to speak briefly about Cape Girardeau and why they need this flood-control project and what brought about the need for the flood-control project. Cape Girardeau, about the tenth largest town in Missouri, the largest town in my district, and one of the oldest towns in Missouri, was established in 1801; was a typical river town and most all of the business at that time was located on the river. They had no flood problems during the first century; in other words, from the time the city was started until 1927 they had only four major floods. Yet, because of the flood-control measures that were authorized by Congress and carried on by the Army engineers principally on the Illinois side of the river, where more than \$73,000,000 has been spent, they created a condition at Cape Girardeau, Mo., which was the direct cause of seven major floods in the 10-year period from 1942 to 1951. On three of these seven floods the crest of the flood was more than 10 feet above flood stage. Because of that fact and because of the authority granted by the Congress the Army engineers have made a survey. They have made some recommendations for this flood-control project at Cape Girardeau, and in House Document No. 204 of the Eighty-first Congress there is a report of the survey and a report of the Army engineers, recommending this project for which the Bureau of the Budget recommended \$1,000,000 this year. While the report of the committee states that there have been no plans formulated for this project and no firm estimates are available, I would call your attention to this document which does include preliminary plans, which does include estimates made as late as 1949, and I think by a simple mathematical calculation, by a comparison, taking into consideration the percentage increase in cost, we do know and can know approximately, as nearly as we do any other project, what this would cost.

The committee also made the statement that assurances from local interests have not been approved by the Secretary of the Army as is required by law. All of you gentlemen who have been interested in flood-control projects know that it has not been customary for the Secretary of the Army to require these assurances, much less give his approval until just before the construction on such projects is started. It has been a practice that those approvals would be given just prior to the beginning of construction. What has the city of Cape Girar-

deau done about getting the approval? It has done everything necessary which has been customary in the past; to the extent of going before the State legislature and having the State legislature pass a law permitting the creation of flood-control districts within a town. It has created two flood-control districts there which have agreed to give the assurances for the right-of-way and every other assurance that would be required by the Government. I say that that is not a legitimate excuse for excluding this from the bill at this time.

Another thing it said here is that the item of flood control at Cape Girardeau does not have an appreciable defense significance. If the operation of a main-line railroad has anything to do with defense, then I say that this project does have something to do with defense. The main line of the Frisco Railroad from St. Louis, Mo., to Memphis, Tenn., and on down to Pensacola, Fla., runs through the town of Cape Girardeau. In 7 years of the last 10, on 261 days this river has been above flood stage. This railroad has been unable to operate when the flood gets out at Cape Girardeau.

Not only that, but under the flood-control projects which are now being considered and for which funds have been approved to complete work which has been started at this time and is now in this bill, they are creating a condition which will further worsen the condition at Cape Girardeau and later make it likely that they will have a flood stage there of 19 feet of water standing in the streets of one of the principal business districts of Cape Girardeau, a situation which did not exist prior to the time that the flood-control projects were built on the Illinois side of the river, where more than \$73,000,000 was spent. Incidentally, I want those flood-control projects in Illinois to be completed. Do not misunderstand me. I am standing by this bill. I hope not a dime will be denied on those projects included in this bill. But I am merely calling to your attention the fact that by spending that money you have created a situation here at Cape Girardeau affecting the railroad, affecting the highways, and affecting some of the largest businesses and the public utilities, including the light plant and the water plant in that city, where they have to sandbag the plants to keep them in operation during the flood stage.

I know the way this House has been acting and, frankly, I have been going along with most of it. I do not want to see this bill increased. I am for economy, but I am calling your attention to the fact that in this particular instance a project which already has the approval of the budget, and which has had a study by the Army engineers, has been denied. Despite that, I am going along with it, but I do hope this bill will not be further reduced.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, on February 21, 1952, I again appeared before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to urge favorable action on a planning item of \$25,000 for the Wells-

ville, N. Y., flood project. This item of \$25,000 is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1953.

To refresh the recollection of the Members of the House, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that in this flooded area in Wellsville, Allegany County, N. Y., there are important defense plants, as General Chorpene testified on page 491 of part I of the civil functions hearings for 1953.

The testimony of General Chorpene in response to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a member of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, is as follows:

Mr. RABAUT. How about Wellsville, N. Y.?

General CHORPENE. That is a local flood protection project for an area which has a number of manufacturing concerns such as the Sinclair Refining Co., Julius Kaiser Co., and Bausch and Lomb. All these plants supplied equipment to the Armed Forces in World War II and are important at this time in connection with defense production.

It is impossible to explain to the people of an American community why no relief from devastating floods can be obtained from the Government which is supported by their taxes in the light of the expenditures of their tax money in foreign countries.

It may be that our international-minded Members who readily vote away our taxpayers' money for projects abroad can explain their state of mind and their votes for gifts, grants and projects abroad in lieu of helping the home folks in time of floods and other disasters.

Let me ask the international spenders to explain their overseas gifts and grants of more than \$100,000,000,000.

Explain to my people, if you will, why you are financing a waterway 354 miles long from the Mediterranean Sea to Lake Geneva, in Switzerland, 1,230 feet above sea level in the heart of the Swiss Alps?

You internationalists who frown upon all items to relieve Americans from floods at home did not hesitate to let our taxpayers finance this waterway. The project calls for 22 dams and 46 power stations. The three dams already completed or under construction cost \$685,000,000 dollars—which means the entire project will cost several billions.

Is it more important to spend several billions on this French waterway with its 22 dams and 46 power stations than to protect the men, women, and children and our defense plants in this country from devastating floods?

The internationalists in the House of Representatives may feel so, but I do not.

These internationalists must be of great influence who are more interested in spending our taxpayers' money for monumental boondoggling abroad than they are in relieving distress from floods at home.

I call attention to the railway station in Rome, Italy, financed by our American taxpayers. This great, monumental railway station is a mile long, into which you could put the Pennsylvania Station, the Grand Central Station, the Cleveland Union Station, and all the railroad stations of the Chicago area, and a few small stations left over.

When our internationalists visit Rovigo, Italy, a town of 40,000 population, between Venice and Bologna, take a look at the tremendous railroad station. It dwarfs our railway stations in Albany, Rochester, and Syracuse and it has private offices for everybody from station-master to lamp lighter. This station was financed by our American taxpayers.

The fact that men, women, and children are the victims of annual floods in an American community is of no consequence to those who support these preposterous foreign boondoggling projects.

What good does it do to shout economy and pretend to cut appropriations at home especially in an election year, and then finance these white elephants abroad, costing many times the amount alleged to be saved on our domestic front?

The internationalists raise their eyes in righteous horror when the wisdom of these foreign expenditures is questioned. They say, "if we do not spend the taxpayers' money abroad, then the foreign nations will go communistic."

This is the excuse the internationalists offer for financing with our taxpayers' money one of the most beautiful buildings in Italy—a new hotel in Milan. It is 10 stories high, pure white, balconies that give every room a veranda; the whole place air-conditioned; the interior decorations are sumptuous; all rooms with baths; a lovely roof garden, and a fine restaurant.

These are but a few of the projects our taxpayers are financing throughout the world.

Let our people drown.

Let their homes be ruined.

Close the schools.

Flood the defense plants.

Create epidemics.

But, far and above this stop communism by building on the Island of Capri, Italy, with its population of 5,000, the luxurious hotel Caesar Augustus, perched high and remote, which has been the cause of less luxurious and less expensive hotels being boarded up.

All this is internationalism in action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the desirability of appropriating funds to start construction on the Hartwell project. This project is to be located on the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina for the purposes of flood control, navigation, and power. The most urgent need for its construction at this time, however, is power. Approximately \$170,000 was made available last year when this project was certified as essential to national defense and the same amount was made available prior to that time for preparing plans for this project so it could be started at an early date. The President has recommended that construction be started in fiscal year 1953, and that \$4,000,000 be appropriated for that purpose.

In these critical days when we are endeavoring to maintain and expand the industrial strength of this country, the

maintenance of an adequate supply of power is essential. Nevertheless there is already a shortage of power-generating facilities in our area, and large additions to our present capacity is necessary if the defense effort is not to be retarded. If curtailment of loads is required to meet the shortages which may occur, defense industries will be the ones to suffer.

The prospects in the southeast region of the country are for a tight power situation for some years to come. Industries in the Southeast have expanded rapidly in recent years due in large measure to the existence of natural resources, and favorable labor and climatic factors there. The Electric Power Advisory Committee of the Defense Production Administration in its recent report of December 31, 1951, indicated that new defense industries are gravitating to the region between the Great Lakes and the Gulf. Many of these industries are of extreme importance in the national defense effort. One of these is the plant which the Atomic Energy Commission is now constructing near Aiken, S. C. Additional new defense industries can be expected if the power supply can be developed to serve their needs. Since in general greater time is required to provide power facilities than the industries they serve, it is necessary that we plan additional power capacity now so that industrial expansion can be made. If such additional power supply is not planned now it may be necessary to either delay new industrial capacity until a power supply can be obtained, or to locate them in unfavorable areas. As an indication of the importance of additional power supply to the defense effort, the Electric Power Advisory Committee stated that—

Our investigation shows that 1 kilowatt of capacity can be fabricated and constructed with one one-hundredth as much of these materials—

Critical material including steel, copper, and aluminum—
as the same kilowatt can supply the power to produce in 1 year.

Power requirements of the southeastern region are expected to increase almost 6,000,000 kilowatts from the end of 1951 to the end of 1954. Similar increases can be expected to occur after 1954. Since these estimates include allowances for new industrial expansion only to the extent that such expansion is known at this time, these estimates may be considered low.

A power installation of 180,000 kilowatts is planned for the Hartwell project, which will permit the development of 460,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. In addition, the stream flow regulation provided by Hartwell will substantially increase the dependable power available at the downstream Clark Hill project, and the minimum stream flow available downstream for furnishing water supply for defense establishments. The Atomic Energy Commission has indicated that the assurance of a uniform quantity of flow by Hartwell will benefit its new plant on the Savannah River below Augusta. Power that the Hartwell project will make available is only a small part of the

expected increase in the needs for the Southeast in any one year, but it is very important to the region and to the Nation. Hartwell provides a most economical source of power; the benefit-cost ratio is 2.19 to 1.

To produce power by fuel-burning plants requires large continuing amounts of manpower and transportation facilities to keep them supplied with fuel. On the other hand, the power in the flowing water which would be converted to electric power is not now being utilized for any purpose, and after Hartwell is completed only a small amount of manpower would be involved. To produce the same amount of energy at fuel-burning plants as could be produced at Hartwell would require about 230,000 tons of coal each year. It does not appear to be wise national economy of either manpower or natural resources to postpone construction of the Hartwell project.

The \$4,000,000 included for Hartwell in the President's budget will permit a construction program to be initiated which will place the first generating unit in service in December 1956. I am convinced, in view of the foregoing factors, that the appropriation of funds in the full amount requested for fiscal year 1953 is a sound investment in national security.

All the agencies which are concerned with the development of our streams, both for increased water supply and electric power, ask that this project go ahead. It was declared and is a national defense project and was recommended for construction by the Director of the Budget, the Army engineers, Defense Electric Power Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Power Commission. A reading of the hearings will convince you that this is true.

I invite your attention to the testimony of Hon. Roger B. McWhorter, chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission, who probably knows this particular stream as well as or better than anyone else. Mr. McWhorter testified at the hearings as follows:

Mr. McWhorter. Mr. Chairman and other members of the committee, the Hartwell Dam project is one of the two key projects in the basin. The reservoir to be created by that dam is one of the largest east of the Mississippi River, with more than 3,000,000 acre-feet; and I think of only one or two more that may be that large, or possibly a little larger.

Without the Hartwell project, it would be impossible to develop and realize the power and water-resource potentialities of that basin. It and the Clarks Hill project, which is the other key project, are both necessary for that purpose, and they are both coming along.

The Hartwell project is useful not only for developing power at that site, but it is a valuable headwater-reservoir improvement in that the regulated flow is beneficial to all downstream plants; and particularly to the great Clarks Hill plant, which is just now nearing completion. That regulated flow is beneficial for several purposes, the most important of which is providing a better flow necessary down to the atomic-energy plant.

I should not be surprised that the maximum flow of the Savannah River is 100 times the minimum flow; and when the flow of a river varies that way, it is likely to get down so low that you would have a real crisis there at the atomic-energy plant. But

with these two great reservoirs around which everything else in that basin will be built, you will always have a regulated flow there of enough to provide a depth in the river of about 8 feet, and of course enough to provide all of the water that the atomic-energy plant might possibly need.

As to the need, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I were in your place, I would feel exactly the same responsibility that you do about authorizing projects in various parts of the country and spending public moneys on them. But this particular project, and projects like it, would not give me any concern at all, because, when one like this is built, it is a prime investment for the people of the country.

The Army engineers have informed you that the benefit-cost ratio of this project exceeds two to one; that is, that the benefits in terms of dollars annually is more than twice as much as the annual cost. So you can readily see that a project like this is a fine thing for the people to have.

Only one more topic will I mention, and that is the need for the power to be produced here. The installation will be 180,000 kilowatts, and the annual energy output nearly half a billion kilowatt-hours, plus an increase in the output down at Clarks Hill of 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours in prime energy. Then into the future, any other hydroelectric plant built off that river, the energy output there will likewise be increased by this regulated flow.

As to the need for the power output of this plant, the only problem is how much more than that will be needed. Certainly every kilowatt of this power will be absorbed just as fast as they can put those generator units in.

In all of my experience with hydroelectric power, extending back over 40 years, I have never known a meritorious project like this one to go begging at all. The power is absorbed almost immediately, and especially will it be in that region because the market is growing so rapidly as to outpace the power installations in the region.

So I think we have no problem there at all. We can be very certain that there will be a market for this power, and it will be badly needed there from the national-defense viewpoint, which, as I understand, a large part of it, possibly more than all of it, will be needed. But it will be needed in the peacetime economy of that region, because that load, too, is growing rapidly enough to take up all of it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, it is your problem to decide what to do about this matter. I would like to leave this thought with you, if I am not too presumptuous. In the case of this project, you certainly cannot go wrong by getting construction started and getting it finished as soon as possible. The merits of this project are already well known to you, and you are past all of these questions of whether or not it is a good project.

It has already been authorized by Congress. You have already appropriated some \$200,000 or \$300,000 for the preliminary work, and the project is ready to go ahead and Army engineers are ready to make their final plans and start on construction.

I thank you very much for your kindness and your patience.

The H-bomb plant on the Savannah River is expected to use as much as 1,000,000,000 gallons of water a day. That is about the same amount of water as is consumed by New York City in one day.

Gentlemen, I cannot see any good reason to justify leaving Hartwell project out of the bill. Surely, to say that no new project, regardless of its importance to national defense, shall be started any

time soon, is no good reason and not the proper course for us to follow.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

TUTTLE CREEK RESERVOIR

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in a few days this House will be asked to put its stamp of approval on about \$50,000,000—fifty thousand million dollars—the ultimate aim of which, if the time comes, is destruction of lives and property. What I seek to do today is to preserve lives and property.

Mr. Chairman, I understand and appreciate the temper of the House. I know that any amendment to this bill seeking an increase of funds is doomed.

For that reason, when the bill is read for amendment I will not seek to increase the amount provided for flood-control construction. The amendment I will offer will seek only to earmark for the construction of Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans., \$5,000,000 of the \$201,000,000 approved by the Appropriations Committee. I am pleading for this action on behalf of thousands of American flood victims in the Kansas and Missouri Valleys.

I need not tell you that those victims of the flood on black Friday, the 13th of July, 1951, were deeply hurt when they learned that the Civil Functions Subcommittee had denied the President's recommendation for funds for Tuttle Creek be approved. They were disappointed further when they learned that the amendment I offered for a portion of the budget figure had been voted down by the Appropriations Committee.

Notwithstanding these rebuffs they still pin their hopes on Congress.

These flood victims have seen billions of dollars, many of them their tax dollars, sent to sufferers overseas; dollars to be spent for the economic improvement of war victims. They have seen ECA supplies sold by European nations to provide funds for dams on European rivers.

They are sure that Congress will recognize their sad plight, living as they are in devastation worse, in many respects, than that of war. They have heard glowing tributes to the courage and fortitude of those victims of war. They have heard how courageous they were in their hours of peril and tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, the courage of these Kansas and Missourians is great. They are rebuilding their homes, their stores, their factories, restoring their farms, because of that courage—courage which is based on faith—faith in a government to which they have given so much. They look to that Government for assurance that such disaster will not strike them again because of the absence of the dam on Tuttle Creek—a dam which will hold 3 to 5 feet off the crest of nearly every future flood.

Mr. Chairman, I could cite you figures showing the hundreds of millions of dollars of loss. That is not necessary. They are all set forth in the hearings, beginning on page 355.

Mr. Chairman, I favor economy. I practice economy. I vote economy. This proposal is an act of economy, for it will preserve lives and countless millions of dollars' worth of property and will pre-

vent further loss to the United States Treasury. The estimated loss to the Treasury is at least \$250,000,000 of income tax from the area flooded in July 1951.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if we can send billions abroad as just described by Mr. REED, we can spend a few millions at home. If we admire courage and faith, here is where a few millions will reward these virtues by merely earmarking five million of the two hundred and one million for flood-control construction for the commencement of construction on this vital installation.

Mr. Chairman, let us not jump on these folks at home while they are down. Let us lift them up and restore their faith in themselves, faith in their country, and faith in their Congress.

The Committee on Appropriations in its report, and its chairman, suggest that we await the report of a Missouri River Basin Commission. That report may be a year coming. That report is not necessary. Tuttle Creek is recognized as a key dam in every plan proposed.

One of the ardent advocates of that commission, Mr. HENNINGS, of Missouri, a Member of the other body, and vice chairman of that commission, just a few days ago, in a news article in the Kansas City Star, from which I quote, said:

Work on the proposed Tuttle Creek flood-protection dam in Kansas should start as quickly as possible. * * * If the engineers say Tuttle Creek dam will prevent another disaster like that of last summer, and that is not controverted, I see nothing to do but go ahead with the project as fast as possible.

Special reference was made to this project by the President in his budget message last January, in which he said:

Only a limited number of new starts for these programs are recommended in this budget. They are restricted to urgently needed power projects in critical shortage areas, flood-control projects in the Kansas-Missouri area, and emergency rehabilitation work which cannot be deferred.

The Kansas-Missouri area during the past summer suffered one of the worst flood disasters in the history of our country. This budget includes twenty-one million dollars for starting construction on Tuttle Creek and Glen Elder Dams, both in Kansas, and for flood-protection work at Topeka, Kans., and Cape Girardeau, Mo.

The Tuttle Creek dam was authorized, Mr. Chairman, in 1938. Its effectiveness in controlling floods in the Kaw River Basin has never been controverted. Had it been built and in operation in 1951, it would not have presented a flood of damaging proportions in July of 1951, but it would have substantially reduced the crest of that flood and, besides, reducing very materially the losses suffered by individuals and industry, in the basin, estimated upward of \$2,000,000,000, would have saved for the Treasury in revenue more than the cost of the construction of the dam.

Mr. Chairman, when presented I trust that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate and commend this fine subcommittee. I

had the opportunity of appearing before them, and I can assure you that they have done a real job and have made a real contribution. I say that in spite of the fact that I am not satisfied with what they did insofar as recommending appropriations for the central and southern flood-control districts of the great State of Florida. I recognize that they are obsessed with economy-itis, just like the rest of us. Now, we all want to economize. We must economize, and sometimes economy hurts, and I suspect it is going to hurt a number of us in this appropriation bill. Nevertheless, we must come to the conclusion that we cannot continue to disregard the economy of our country and unless we, as Members of Congress, begin to save, this Nation will become bankrupt. Up to the present time I have voted for reductions in appropriation bills. I possibly have made mistakes, as you did. It is very easy for us to make a mistake in the interest of economy, that is, thinking it is in the interest of economy, when at the same time it is not. So far as my project is concerned, last year we had the sum of \$6,000,000. Do you know what this committee has done to this project this year? They have knocked it down to the sum of \$4,000,000 to do something down there that is in the best interests of this Nation; to do something down there that will tend toward the security of this Nation. Now why do I say that? I say it because this particular area, some 15,750 square miles, is the bread basket of the United States. We furnish vegetables and foodstuffs from that area that feeds the rest of you gentlemen. Whenever we put some hindrance or obstacle in the way of the development of a project that means so much not to Florida alone but the entire Nation, I say we are going just a little bit too far on the side of economy.

What has this Congress done up to the present time about this project? In 1948 we adopted the first phase of this project, and it was to cost some \$70,000,000. The Congress at that time authorized an appropriation of \$18,500,000. In the Eighty-first Congress we recognized the merit of that project down there and authorized, and you voted for it, the sum of \$20,000,000. This Congress has authorized \$36,500,000, but do you know what the Congress has given us up to the present time? \$13,500,000!

I do not know of any other flood-control project where the State and the local authorities have contributed as much as we have in this particular instance. We have contributed up to the present time on this project the sum of \$8,457,802, and this Government has appropriated \$13,800,000, that is all. I do not know of another project and I do not know of any Member of Congress who knows of another project, especially a flood-control project, that has contributed so liberally as has the State of Florida. This is a project that is represented by the Army engineers to have a ratio of benefits of 2.26 to 1. This is an investment. The lands down there are increasing in value. By virtue of this project the internal-revenue taxes will in the course of a few years pay off every bit of the contribution you are making.

It is a project that we ought not to delay in its completion. This is a means of saving lives, it is a means of saving property, and it is a means of producing foodstuffs for this Nation. I hope that somehow we may be able to get enough to continue this project. Some \$3,500,000 is recommended by the Army engineers. The subcommittee cut us from \$6,000,000 last year to \$4,000,000 this year. We have the work outlined down there, especially one levee, levee No. 1, which is a part of this project, and the completion of that one levee in the event of a flood or a hurricane, which we have witnessed, would do much for the protection of life, limb, and property. I hope there will be some way found so that the Congress can restore to us at least \$5,000,000, which was included in the budget, and which was reduced by this fine committee down to \$4,000,000.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, during the committee hearings on the bill now being considered, a question arose in connection with the Pine Flat project on the Kings River in California. Concern was expressed regarding the apparent delay in contract negotiations between the Kings River water users and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to repayment by the water users for irrigation benefits resulting from Pine Flat.

Under such circumstances, I believe that now is the time to make it clear to the Members of the House that the local water users have acted with diligence and in good faith. They have always been willing, and are still willing, to pay the United States a fair price for the irrigation benefits from Pine Flat.

The Bureau of Reclamation, however, has stalled the negotiations and made impossible and unreasonable the demands upon the water users. The Bureau has done this because it desires to gain control not only of Pine Flat but of the waters of the Kings River, which is against the wishes and desires of both the water users and the Congress.

The Pine Flat project was authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944, after 4 years of hearings in committee. At all these hearings, representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared in opposition to the inclusion of the Pine Flat project in the act, urging that the project was predominantly for conservation and only secondarily for flood control. Thus, it may be said that the Bureau delayed the construction of the Pine Flat Dam for 4 years.

But even after the act was approved by Congress and signed by President Roosevelt the Bureau continued to appear before Congressional committees and oppose the granting of appropriations for the project. All this resulted in further delay, amounting to another 4 years.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, in recognition of the incidental irrigation benefits that will accrue from the Pine Flat project, provides that "the Secretary

of War shall make arrangements for payment to the United States by the State or other responsible agency, either in lump sum or annual instalments, for conservation storage when used." However, in May 1946, President Truman issued a directive requiring that the Secretary of the Interior negotiate a contract with the Kings River water users under the provisions of the reclamation law.

The Kings River water users always recognized that Pine Flat would yield irrigation benefits, and expressed their willingness to pay the United States a fair price for them. Accordingly, in 1945 studies were made by the State engineer of California and, independently, by a board of engineers employed by the water users. Both reported that \$10,000,000 was a fair price for Pine Flat irrigation benefits, and the Kings River Water Association, representing a large majority of the diversions on the river, informed the Bureau of its willingness to pay that sum, and also laid down 15 conditions under which the water users were willing to sign a contract. These 15 points were designed to protect the water rights of the Kings River farmers and the administrative freedom of Kings River irrigation districts and other agencies under the laws of California. The Bureau was sent a copy of them in July 1946.

In October of the same year Commissioner Straus sent point-by-point responses to the Kings River Water Association. One of these read as follows:

The Kings River interests, present and future, should and will have the benefit of storage at Pine Flat to the full extent needed for irrigation service, subject only to the priority of flood-control requirements as determined by the Secretary of War.

Since the Kings River interests claim all the normal flow of the river on the basis of 50 to 80 years of continuous beneficial use, that statement by the Commissioner of Reclamation encouraged them to feel that a mutually acceptable contract might be possible of achievement. However, within less than 2 years the Bureau bluntly stated in its reply brief in the first Kings River power hearings:

The Bureau is without authority and without intention of offering a contract which would give the water users jurisdiction over any reservoir space, or any direct control in the operation of the dam.

Confronted with this statement, the Kings River water users began to wonder what they were supposed to get in return for their money. Storage space in a reservoir is worthless unless the user has jurisdiction over it, and unless the water users had control over the irrigation operation of the project there would be no guaranty against the impairment of their water rights, these rights being based on the mean daily flow of the river.

Meanwhile, the Secretaries of War and Interior had agreed on a figure not to exceed \$14,250,000 for the irrigation benefits at Pine Flat. The water users thought this figure high. Over a 50-year period the flood waters of Kings River

have averaged 165,000 acre-feet per year, and that would be approximately the benefit to irrigation accruing from Pine Flat. If the Kings River interests agreed to pay \$14,250,000 in 40 years for that amount of conserved flood water they would be paying for it about \$2.15 an acre-foot. But the Bureau charges only \$1.50 an acre-foot for class II water delivered by the Central Valley project, and Pine Flat water, available only at 5- to 10-year intervals, most certainly would be class II water. It also should be noted that the average cost of water delivered to the farmers throughout the Kings River area is about \$1 an acre-foot, and this is class I water, not class II.

Nevertheless, the water users continued to press the Bureau for a clear statement of its position and intentions. It seemed to them that the Flood Control Act of 1944 was still on the books; that the presidential directive of May 1946 did no more than make the Bureau a negotiating agent for the United States; and, on advice of counsel, that Pine Flat is not a reclamation project and that reclamation law does not apply to it. At one time or another they submitted these propositions to the Bureau, requesting comments. They also, on many occasions, asked the Bureau to submit to them a form of proposed contract.

On January 16, 1950—3 years and 8 months after the President had directed the Secretary of the Interior to begin negotiations with the water users—the Kings River Water Association received a draft of contract from the Bureau. This draft was thoroughly analyzed by attorneys for the association and many of its member agencies. But even casual reading of it revealed the fact that it was designed to establish the Bureau in full control of Pine Flat irrigation operations and to place intolerable and illegal restrictions upon the administrative procedures of such public agencies as irrigation districts. This contract draft, moreover, did not specify the amount of repayment required of the water users, though under California law no irrigation district may sign an open-end contract. It contained the so-called 160-acre-limitation provision. And in section after section it provided that in important administrative matters the decision of the Secretary of the Interior should be final. The board of directors of the Kings River Water Association promptly and unanimously voted to reject this contract draft in its entirety, and gave to press and radio a carefully detailed account of its reasons for doing so. The Bureau met this statement with a blast of abusive publicity, Richard L. Boke, regional director, even descending to threats. If the Kings River people did not come to heel, he said, in effect, the Bureau would see to it that further appropriations for Pine Flat were withheld by Congress.

On March 9, 1950, the water users offered the Bureau a contract draft of their own. This was prepared by Walter H. Stammer, a leading Fresno attorney, in conformity with a set of principles set forth by Gilbert H. Jertberg, counsel for

the association, in a letter dated February 6. Jertberg wrote, in response to a query from the association:

It appears to me that the form of contract should be restricted to the acquisition of storage space, that portion of the cost of Pine Flat to be borne by the units desiring storage, the method of payment, and criteria for the operation of the dam. It is my view that those are the only subjects covered by existing law, and that there is no law authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to take over complete control and administration of the water to be stored at Pine Flat for conservation uses.

The Bureau told the press that this contract had some good features and that it would receive consideration. Actually that was the end of the matter. At their next meeting with Bureau officials the negotiating committee on the Kings River Water Association discovered with astonishment that they were supposed to discuss the rejected draft of January 16 rather than their own. The committee nevertheless continued to seek for some area of agreement with the Bureau; their degree of success being indicated by the following quotation from a letter of June 27, 1950, addressed by Philip A. Gordon, chairman of the association, to Jack W. Rodner, local manager of the Bureau:

Since . . . March 9 a few meetings have been held by the committee and Bureau representatives, but nothing has been achieved, mainly because the Bureau representatives resolutely refused to discuss any contract except the rejected one. . . . The water users demand that negotiations be reopened immediately on the basis of the form of contract they submitted on March 9. . . . Let us remind you that we propose to negotiate with the Bureau of Reclamation "for conservation storage when used" in the Pine Flat Reservoir, as Congress directed in the Flood Control Act of 1944. . . . In short, we propose to adhere to our original offer to pay for actual benefits what they are reasonably worth, and we also insist on negotiating within the conditions clearly laid down by Congress.

Nothing happened until July 27; then the Bureau came up with a second contract draft. This one was hardly more acceptable than the first. The open-end feature had been retained. There was no specific guaranty to respect local water rights established under State law. Many other such points could be cited; but what really made this draft completely unacceptable was the bureaucratic philosophy clearly implicit in every section. The water users were not being treated as free citizens bargaining with an agency of the Government supposed to rest on the consent of the governed.

The contracts offered the water users by the Bureau were simply proposals to place them and their locally operated administrative agencies under the protective custody of a single appointed official, the Secretary of the Interior. The validity of their water rights received no formal acknowledgment. In the opinion of counsel, all their other rights, as guaranteed by California law, would have been placed in jeopardy by the signing of either contract.

The discouragement now beginning to be felt by the water users had another

source; while the local office of the Bureau was supposed to be negotiating with them in good faith, the Secretary of the Interior was trying to obtain control of the King River system, including both the Pine Flat project and the proposed upstream power developments, by having it integrated with the Central Valley project by act of Congress.

A bill, H. R. 5264, drafted by the Bureau and introduced by Representative Cecil F. White, formerly of the Ninth California District, in the spring of 1949 was stopped in the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Public Lands after representatives of the water users appeared in opposition before the committee. In November 1950, Mr. White retired to private life after a campaign based to a great extent on the issue of local against Federal control of water and power. But within a week after this election had shown clearly the will and determination of the people directly affected, Secretary Chapman sent another bill to the Speaker of the House with a request that its introduction and passage be expedited. This bill, like the previous one, proposed to integrate the land and water resources of the Kings River area with the Central Valley project and language which seemed to the water users and their counsel to mean expropriation, if it meant anything.

The Secretary was unable to find a Member of the House willing to lend his name to this bill, but that did not discourage the Secretary. Since that time he has offered at least two more such bills. Now he is trying to get by court action what the Federal Power Commission has twice denied him; namely, power rights on the north and middle forks of the Kings River and at Pine Flat Dam. It should be noted that if the Federal courts should overrule the FPC in this matter the Secretary would have effective practical control of the river, and the water users probably would be compelled to enter into costly and protracted legal action for the protection of their water rights. The outcome of such litigation would be far from certain in view of a number of recent Supreme Court decisions affecting State and local rights under attack by the Federal Government.

Following is a condensed account of how the Bureau of Reclamation negotiates.

September 19, 1950: At a meeting with Bureau representatives on this date S. T. Harding, engineering consultant for the negotiating committee, requested a statement from the Bureau as to exactly how much Kings River water the agency claimed to have purchased from Miller & Lux by virtue of the grasslands contract, how much money the Bureau considered this water to be worth and whether the so-called croplands interest had any rights to such water. A few days later Charles L. Kaupke, chief engineer and water master of the association, followed up this request by telephone and was informed that Bureau engineers would go to work immediately on the job of assembling these data.

October 6, 1950: At a meeting with the Bureau on this date, S. T. Harding and Gilbert H. Jertberg, counsel for the committee, stated that a contract acceptable to the water users "must contain an express recognition by the United States that the rights of the members of the association to the waters of Kings River are as set forth in the water-right indenture and attached schedules." Harding and Jertberg also informed the Bureau that the United States should "expressly disclaim any rights to the waters covered by said agreements and schedules," and suggested that agreements and schedules be incorporated in the contract by reference. The Bureau attorneys agreed to consider these points and prepare a draft of contract provisions including them.

November 30: In a letter to Leland O. Graham, regional counsel for the Bureau, Gilbert H. Jertberg said that the promised draft had not been received, adding that "we would appreciate having it in the very near future."

January 5, 1951: In a letter to Jertberg, Graham suggested, for discussion purposes, the following language relating to the water-right indenture and diversion schedules:

The United States will interpose no objection to the division of the Kings River, as provided in these documents.

January 18: In a letter to Graham, Jertberg said of the above proposal:

I do not feel that the language suggested by you will be satisfactory. I feel that the contract should provide an express recognition by the United States that the rights of the members of the association to the waters of Kings River are as set forth in the various documents. . . . and that the United States expressly disclaims any rights to such water.

In the same letter Jertberg referred to the question of grassland water rights and Graham's statement on January 5 that the inclusion in a contract of the language therein proposed would be "predicated on the assumption that the Kings River interests will purchase from the United States the rights with respect to the Kings River which the United States now owns." Jertberg said:

The negotiating committee has been endeavoring to find out for some time exactly what rights are claimed by the United States with respect to Kings River. We have been anxious to know the extent of such rights, the basis of the claims, and the cost to the United States of the rights claimed by it. . . . Up to the present time it [this information] has not been received.

February 27: In a letter to Graham, Jertberg called attention to his previous letter of January 18, to which "up to the present time I have had no reply." He stated that the January 18 letter also urged that a meeting between the negotiating committee and the Bureau should be held at an early date, and that Mr. Karl W. Shattuck, chairman of the negotiating committee, now urged that such meeting be held promptly.

February 28: A letter from Graham to Jertberg bearing this date contains the following:

I am informed that the Bureau engineers and others have been conducting studies

with reference to the water rights owned by the United States and that within a very short time Mr. S. T. Harding will be contacted, and shortly thereafter a meeting can be arranged with the negotiating committee.

March 3: On this date Jertberg wrote to Graham noting that he would pass along to the negotiating committee the information contained in Graham's letter of February 28, "so that they may hold themselves in readiness for such a meeting." Until February 13, 1952, no such meeting was held.

On February 13, 1952, a meeting was held with the Bureau. Present were the negotiating committee of the association and the board of directors of the Kings River Conservation District. At this time the Bureau stated that it would not be able to discuss the actual amount of repayment until it learned whether or not the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, intended to make a new evaluation of costs and benefits at Pine Flat. The agency also intimated that the successful negotiation of a contract would depend upon the willingness of the water users to pay \$2,000,000—in addition to the Pine Flat repayment—for the water claimed by virtue of the so-called grasslands purchase from Miller and Lux.

Mr. A. J. Quist, president of the Kings River Conservation District, made it clear that the district board was prepared to insist on two things: First, a discount for cash in the event the water users decided on a lump-sum payment, as authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944; second, a clear and definite statement from the Bureau as to what and how much water it claimed to be able to sell by reason of the grasslands purchase. To the first, the Bureau replied that it is not authorized by law to waive interest in a lump-sum deal. To the second it suggested that association and district engineers make studies with a view to determining the amount of water for which the Bureau is asking \$2,000,000.

It should be noted that Charles L. Kaupke, chief engineer and water master of the association, already had made studies of this matter sufficiently detailed to convince him that the Bureau purchased little, if any, Kings River water from Miller & Lux. The record also shows that Federal Judge Peirson M. Hall, in a memorandum of opinion dated April 12, 1950, and dealing with the suit of some 1,100 San Joaquin River water users to protect their rights from usurpation by the Bureau, said of this transaction:

The net effect of (Government) counsel's statement was that Miller & Lux had no water rights, that they were a large and rich corporation and would hold up the project by groundless litigation, to prevent which they were given approximately \$2,000,000 * * * without any statutory authority for such payment of money.

The water users agree with Judge Hall, and consequently are of the opinion that the Bureau, in this water purchase deal, is merely trying to recover from them the money the agency paid

Miller & Lux for good will. The following letter was sent on February 23:

Mr. E. F. SULLIVAN,
Acting District Manager, United States
Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno,
Calif.:

With reference to the matter of further negotiations respecting purchase by the Kings River interests of water claimed by the United States by virtue of the so-called grasslands acquirement from Miller & Lux:

Your attention is directed to the letter addressed by Mr. Charles L. Kaupke, chief engineer and water master of the Kings River Water Association, to Mr. Jack W. Rodner, district engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, and dated September 25, 1951.

In this letter Mr. Kaupke acknowledged receipt of a compilation of Fresno slough outflows during the period 1926 through 1949, and stated that it has been checked and found to be correct. However, Mr. Kaupke then went on to say that it would be helpful to have a statement of the actual rights which the United States claims to have acquired by virtue of the grasslands purchase for the entire period of record, and reminded Mr. Rodner that he asked for this information about a year prior to September 1951. To complete this record, it should be stated that Mr. Kaupke, to date, has received no reply to that letter.

The Kings River interests, represented by both the Kings River Water Association and the Kings River Conservation District, are of the opinion that they, as prospective buyers, must know what the Bureau of Reclamation has to sell before they can enter into any negotiations respecting price. The compilation of Fresno slough outflows referred to above is not a statement of rights claimed by the United States, but merely a description of waters that can be used beneficially by the United States on San Joaquin Valley lands.

The division of water resources, State of California, has divided the waters of the San Joaquin River into three classes: (1) Croplands rights; (2) grasslands rights; (3) uncontrolled water. Before fruitful negotiations can be entered into respecting the purchase of Fresno slough water the Kings River interests wish to be informed, not only as to how much water the United States actually claims to be able to sell, but also how this water is classified among the three categories listed at the beginning of this paragraph.

It also would be helpful to know what provision the United States would make in the event of the purchase under discussion to protect the Kings River interests from third-party claims to all or part of the water these interests are asked to purchase.

We request a reply to this letter within 10 days.

Very truly yours,

KARL W. SHATTUCK,
Chairman, Negotiating Committee,
Kings River Water Association.

A. J. QUIST,
President, Board of Directors, Kings
River Conservation District.

As of March 12 no reply to this letter had been received by either the association or the conservation district. On March 5, however, the association received a letter from the Bureau, with a copy to the district, of which these are the pertinent paragraphs:

As you are aware, we some time ago contacted the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in order to ascertain whether, in view of the increased construction costs of Pine Flat Dam, there would be a new allocation of costs with respect to Pine Flat project.

We now have received a communication from the district engineer of the Sacramento district of the Corps of Engineers, in which we have been informed "that the Department of the Army does not contemplate making a new cost allocation on Pine Flat project either now or in the future."

In view of the decision that there is to be no new cost allocation, we are prepared to proceed with the negotiations for a repayment contract upon the basis of the reimbursable irrigation allocation of \$14,250,000. The agreement to repay this sum, of course, will not include the payment for the so-called Fresno Slough rights.

To this letter the following reply was sent on March 7:

Mr. JACK W. RODNER,
District Manager, Bureau of Reclamation,
Fresno, Calif.

DEAR MR. RODNER: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 5 and addressed to Mr. Karl W. Shattuck. We are pleased to learn that the Bureau is prepared to continue negotiations of a Pine Flat repayment contract on the basis of the Corps of Engineers evaluation of irrigation benefits at \$14,250,000. We assume that this figure may now be regarded as final unless it should be changed by Congress. However, we have not abandoned the position that a lump-sum payment of \$14,250,000 less interest for 40 years would be more likely to prove acceptable to the water users, who, after all, will make the final decision for the Kings River area.

In respect to payment for the so-called Fresno Slough rights, also mentioned in your letter, our position was clearly defined in the letter of February 23, addressed to Mr. E. F. Sullivan and signed by Mr. Shattuck and myself. Though we requested a reply to that letter within 10 days, none has been received to date. The Kings River Water Association has been asking the same questions we asked in that letter since September 1950. Yet it seems obvious that until the water users' representatives are told what water the United States has to sell negotiations respecting price will be impossible.

Very truly yours,

A. J. QUIST,
President, Board of Directors, Kings
River Conservation District.

And here for the moment ends what the water users regard as a chronicle of wasted time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, just one short year ago the President of the United States, as well as many Members of the Congress, flew or made trips to Kansas to view the great flood of 1951. This flood did irreparable damage to our State, both to our agricultural, industrial, and economic structures. The total flood loss in our State amounted to over \$700,000,000. After viewing this flood, the President of the United States filed a supplemental budget request with the United States Senate requesting \$3,000,000 construction money for the Toronto Dam on the Verdigris River watershed. He also requested the Congress for \$250,000 to complete planning and to start construction on the Strawn Dam on the Neosho River. These rivers and these projects that I mentioned are a part of the Arkansas River watershed. This is a part of the waters in Kansas

that flood south through southern Kansas into Oklahoma. These projects have been regularly authorized and approved by the Congress. Extensive work and engineering and planning have been done on these watersheds by the Army engineers. The people of this area of Kansas are practically in complete agreement as to the needs, necessity, and the eventual efficiency of these projects. It is my judgment that these projects are just as needed now as they were a year ago. In fact, the need for these projects has existed over a great period of years. To my personal knowledge the Neosho River has flooded 50 times in the past 25 years, and the Verdigris nearly as often. The damage created in the 1951 flood along these rivers alone amounted to millions of dollars. It seems to me that it would be most economical for our Congress to grant money for construction of dams on these watersheds which flood year after year. These floods are in our most fertile valleys and if protection is not properly provided for by the Congress with adequate flood control, these valleys will become a desolate area, unfarmed and uninhabited, and of course, if such a condition is allowed to continue to exist, will eventually work a definite hardship on our State and on the Nation.

It seems to me if Members of the Congress, during the past several years, have been able to provide hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent on the Po River in Italy for flood control and power projects and irrigation, and if the Congress can provide money in the guise of national defense to be spent on the Rhine and the Rhone Rivers in Europe to provide water transportation, power, and flood control, surely they can give us some of our own money to spend in our own country for the protection of our own people and for the protection of our own economy. Especially do I think they should do so when it will help protect the agricultural capacity to produce in our country, and also help increase the industrial capacity of our people. There are many, many reasons why these projects should be built, evidence of which the people living in these valleys have presented to the proper committees of the Congress, as well as the evidence that has been made part of the record in former years by the Army engineers. Just why the Bureau of the Budget did not submit to this Congress requests for these projects is unexplainable in the light of the evidence of their need and in view of the President's supplemental requests of only one short year ago.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, today I share with other

representatives of areas within the great Missouri River Basin a keen disappointment in the action of the committee that if sustained will seriously retard the work of flood control and power development along the Missouri River. Vagrant and uncontrolled, the Missouri River is frequently a scourge. Controlled and with its power applied to the uses of man, it is a great potential asset.

Accordingly, after long and patient planning, construction works along the river were initiated and the thoroughness of the planning is shown by the fact that the several structures fit into a pattern. The initial one of these structures has been completed. Others are in varying stages of construction. None of this work ought to be halted or retarded at this time. Floods along the Missouri River have come and will come again. Water is needed for irrigation. More hydroelectric power is needed along the course of the river.

Others here have spoken of the need for uninterrupted work on projects in course of construction upriver from the Nebraska-South Dakota State line. I make particular reference to the proposed construction of a dam and reservoir at Gavins Point. Gavins Point Dam is not an independent, isolated project. It is, as I have heretofore pointed out, one of the integral parts of the system of dams planned to control floodwaters and to produce hydroelectric power along hundreds of miles of the main stem of the Missouri River.

General Chorpene recently stated in the course of his testimony before the Civil Functions Subcommittee that "all of these dams on the Missouri River are worked out as a system to solve flood control in one, and in another there will be primarily power, but altogether they are parts of a system and all of the dams must be in place to get the greatest benefit. If one is left out, then some of the advantages of flood control, power or irrigation that goes to make up the whole will be lost." The dams above Gavins Point—Fort Randall, Oahe, Garrison, and so forth—have proceeded in construction according to schedule and in this schedule Gavins Point should be under way so as to reach completion at the time that the whole system has been finished and is ready for the combined job of flood control and power development.

Money for preliminary work on Gavins Point Dam was provided last year and an appreciable amount of that money has been actually spent or has been obligated. It is presently apparent that if the requested \$13,000,000, or a substantial part thereof, is not appropriated this year, no more of the money provided last year can be spent and all progress at Gavins Point will cease. This is a situation that ought not to be allowed to occur for the reason that arguments for economy, however powerful they may be, are outweighed by the arguments of expediency and necessity affecting this interior portion of the United States.

I again point out that Gavins Point Dam is a regulating dam essential to the

full operation of the whole system along the Missouri River and that the power potential of this particular project is vital to the whole of the community that may share in the utilization of that power. This power will benefit rural electrification as well as industrial development.

It is all well enough to irrigate otherwise arid acres and to underwrite the construction of hydroelectric plants throughout the world, but it is quite all right, too, to use American dollars to keep flood waters off of the richest acres in the world and to develop hydroelectric power for the immediate use of our farms and factories. It is only this morning that I received a letter from a person living within a short distance of the Gavins Point Dam site who has been greatly distressed by the report that the Committee on Appropriations has denied any appropriations for Gavins Point Reservoir in fiscal 1953. The writer's comment is so sincere and so pertinent that I quote the following for the information of the House:

It is with a great deal of regret that we notice in the papers the past few days that the House Appropriations Committee has declined to allocate to the Gavins Point Dam any funds to operate with during this coming year.

No doubt to the people of the eastern part of these United States this Missouri River project means very little, but to us out here it is a vital part of our economy and program. To me it seems very unfair to cut these appropriations which would help our own people, the ones who help pay for these projects through income and other taxes, while on the other hand they do not seem to hesitate one moment to spend billions to help other people in foreign countries. I am not against foreign aid, but I also believe that our own people should start to get some benefit from all the money that is collected by taxes here in our own States. People would be less critical of the spending that is going on in Washington if they could see some benefit accrue to our own people in this country. This Gavins Point project is one example that in the years to come will benefit millions of people, our own people, people who through their sweat and work make it possible to pay taxes that are being spent by you Representatives and Senators in Washington.

Please keep our own people foremost in your mind when you consider bills, keep our own United States ahead of anything else. Save these United States and you save the world, lose the battle here and we lose the world battle.

I am going to ask that you do everything in your power to convince the committee that this Missouri River project is vital to our country and to this part of the United States.

I commend this to the thoughtful consideration of all of you.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to right a wrong impression that one might gather from reading the report of the committee, insofar as it relates to the Gavins Point, Nebr., and Oahe, S. Dak. projects in the Missouri River development program. Referring to page 7 of the report, one would gather that the Gavins Point project is a waste of public funds and of

highly questionable character. The report says in short:

Estimates submitted in connection with the present project shows an approximately 30-percent increase over the estimated cost of the project in fiscal year 1952. Such estimating procedures point out the utter lack of firm-cost estimates and cause the committee to regard the economic feasibility of the project as highly questionable.

Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the true facts. The benefit-cost ratio is the same today that it was a year ago when the Congress appropriated \$2,000,000 to start construction of Gavins Point in spite of the 30-percent increase. General Chorpene testified as follows before the subcommittee:

This project is fully justified, as I have stated before, on the basis of the benefits produced at the project for power and flood control. The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.1 for this project acting alone. Benefits for power at the site total \$3,140,000, flood control \$350,000, and the annual charges will amount to \$3,170,000. In addition full power benefits adding \$5,000,000 annually are achieved at Fort Randall from operation of Gavins Point.

Since Gavins Point is in reality a reregulating reservoir for the Fort Randall project, it is desirable to consider these two projects as one unit. Proper operation of Fort Randall for the maximum benefits is only possible through the addition of Gavins Point. Therefore the benefits and costs of the two should be considered together.

The combined Fort Randall-Gavins Point annual benefits are \$18,348,000, and annual costs are \$12,595,000, giving a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.46 to 1.

The committee asked General Chorpene very specifically if the cost-benefit ratio was still the same in spite of the increased costs and the general replied "Yes."

It is rather difficult for me to understand how the committee can question General Chorpene's testimony on Gavins Point and refuse funds for this project, and then turn around and approve in full the budget requests for the Maysville, Ky. project, where General Chorpene testifies that the cost-benefit ratio has decreased from 1.21 to 1 to 1.11 to 1, during the past year, on account of increased costs.

It must also be stated in all fairness to the Army engineers that the 30 percent increase for this project was the result principally of increases in the power potential of Gavins Point from 81,000 kilowatts to 100,000 kilowatts which was done at the request of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Members of this body may have the facts, I want to call your attention to the fact that the Missouri River program was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. This program is made up of approximately 100 projects, each dependent upon the other, Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Oahe, and Garrison, N. Dak., are the four main units. They are integral parts of the whole program. They are so vital that anything but a speedy completion of them will not only impair, but in some instances jeopardize the program.

The projects I have called to your attention are under construction. They are not new projects and do not fall

within the committee formula as new starts. The second criteria used by the committee was, and I quote:

The elimination of certain features on projects that will not interfere with the orderly completion of portions presently under construction.

Apparently the committee felt that Gavins Point could be eliminated because it would not interfere with the orderly completion of portions presently under construction. This was done, in spite of the fact that the committee had been told every year since 1944 that Gavins Point is essential to Fort Randall which will be closed this summer.

I do want to commend the committee for their efforts to effectuate economy, but I do believe that some of their efforts were misguided and I would like to tell you why I feel as I do.

Gavins Point is absolutely essential for Fort Randall. It was designed that way. Fort Randall cannot operate at maximum efficiency without Gavins Point. As a matter of fact, Fort Randall will lose in power benefits alone \$5,000,000 annually without Gavins Point. This is not economy in my book, and I am sure the committee agrees with me. Not only is Gavins Point essential to firm up the power at Fort Randall, but also to re-regulate the flow down stream thereby preventing bank erosion and property damage from floods and providing a steady flow of water downstream for navigation, all of which is part of the over-all program.

Mr. Chairman, as further proof of the necessity for funds for Gavins Point, I want to read just one short paragraph of a letter I received from F. J. Lawton, Director of the Budget, dated March 26, 1951. The paragraph reads:

I have written you at this length concerning the background underlying the decision to defer construction of Gavins Point until fiscal year 1952 in order to stress the fact that, at a time of extremely rigid budget limitations, the most careful planning and scheduling of public works improvements is essential. This decision does not, of course, minimize in the slightest the necessity for initiating construction in 1952. It is essential that the project be started in 1952 in order that it will be ready in 1955 to perform its primary function of reregulating power releases from Fort Randall. Otherwise, it will be impossible to obtain full utilization of power generation from Fort Randall.

Now, I recognize that some members of the committee are violently opposed to Government power. I am not going to argue that point other than to say that the question is now moot. This project was started in 1944 for flood control, navigation, and irrigation. Power is only a byproduct of the project and a very important one in my section of the country and also pretty lucrative for the Government. When Gavins Point will add \$5,000,000 annually to the income of Fort Randall alone, that is something that cannot be brushed aside and in my opinion false economy not to accept.

Not only is Gavins Point a money maker for the Federal Government, but it will supply power that is so badly needed in South Dakota and surrounding States.

Recently, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan asked for increased farm pro-

duction for the war effort. In the interest of national defense we must maintain the agriculture production line. Food is as much a part of the battle as are guns, ships, and planes. This is not time to cut the power that turns the wheels of agriculture.

With the power requirements in this market area showing a sharp growth from 1940 to 1950, it is estimated that during the next two decades the energy requirements for this market area will increase from 1,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1950 to 4,200,000,000 in 1960 and to 6,900,000,000 by 1970. It is estimated that in 1953 when the first unit at Fort Randall is scheduled for completion, the energy requirements for the area will be 2,400,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, and by 1957, at which time the first Gavins Point power should be available, the total firm energy requirements of the area will be 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Even assuming no retirement of existing fuel-burning plants in the system, it is expected that energy requirements will only barely be met by 1957, if the present schedule for completion of Fort Randall and Gavins Point projects is maintained.

Turning now specifically to the Oahe project, Mr. Chairman, those familiar with the authorized plan of development of the tremendous important water resources of the Missouri River Basin know that Oahe is one of the four giant projects that are basic to the plan. Of the four similar projects in this category, Fort Peck is completed, Garrison and Fort Randall are more than half completed, but Oahe has only barely been started. Ultimately the Oahe project will have greater hydroelectric power capacity than any other main stem Missouri River Dam now authorized, and its combined flood control and water conservation benefits will be exceeded only by the Garrison Reservoir.

Information appearing in the hearings before the Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee indicates that the Army engineers requested \$6,230,000 to be included within ceiling in the President's budget for fiscal year 1953, to permit the minimum efficient progress on this job. However, the budget allowed only \$3,500,000 and now the House committee is recommending that this amount be further cut to \$700,000. The total costs to the Government of such a meat-ax type of cut on a project under construction far outweigh any transitory advantages of postponing or curtailing appropriations. Large, continuous construction and supply contracts have been let for the excavation of the spillway approach channel, the south abutment, the construction of part of the main dam earth embankment and the steel sheet pile cutoff wall in the foundation. The appropriation of only \$700,000 for this project would result in stopping most of these going construction and supply contracts. The contract for stage II earth work on the dam was awarded recently to extend the embankment on the west bank of the river. If the House committee cut of funds for this project is effected, it will be necessary to suspend operations on excavation and embankment in this critical part of the struc-

ture, with consequent deterioration resulting from exposure to the elements.

That Congress has been appropriating at too slow a rate to insure efficient construction progress is evident from the statistics:

Fiscal year 1948 and prior years (planning)	\$2,000,000
Fiscal year 1949 (first construction funds)	2,000,000
Fiscal year 1950	2,000,000
Fiscal year 1951	3,600,000
Fiscal year 1952	3,770,000

Thus, the project has been under construction at a reduced rate of progress for more than 3 years, and the committee now proposes to cut the appropriations to such an extent that it will be impossible to meet the required rate of installation of hydroelectric power planned at the dam. Studies made by the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Interior prove that the electrification of farms, the increase in industrial loads in the region—particularly the petroleum industry—and the normal increase in demand for power to continue developments in the area will result in a six hundred to seven hundred million kilowatt-hour requirements annually, over and above the power to be supplied by all the other proposed plants such as Garrison, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point. These studies support the fact that the present schedule for construction of Oahe Dam must be maintained.

From an engineering and operating standpoint it is very important that the Oahe project be built simultaneously with Fort Randall, or nearly so, because the Fort Randall spillway is designed—and being constructed—under the assumption that the Oahe project is in existence. As indicated by testimony presented by the Army engineers in support of the civil functions appropriations for fiscal year 1952, the Fort Randall spillway cannot pass the design flood which might occur unless the Oahe Dam and Reservoir is in place.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of true economy and our defense effort, I sincerely hope that the Senate will restore the cuts made by the House Appropriations Committee for Gavins Point and Oahe and that our conferees will concur at the proper time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this bill can go down in history as the big-time operators' bill. It is the first time in my experience around the Capitol that an appropriation for civil functions has come to this House that did not have one little project of some nature in it.

This is a splendid committee. There are splendid gentlemen on both sides of this House who are members of that committee. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has put his finger on the trouble in this matter. That is the shelving of projects.

I am not before the House asking for any new project; I am before the House calling your attention to the fact that you have a small business committee in Congress. I think now you had better set up a small appropriation committee in Congress for civil functions.

We built the inland waterway from Maine to Florida, and we have feeder ports. The problem today is that the inland waterway is 12 feet deep and the major feeder ports are from 7 to 9 feet. We must get them to conform to the inland waterway in the matter of depth, in order to carry transportation.

I have a little difficulty, as other Members of the Congress, about these small projects. I have one that the engineers created themselves, turning salt water into a fresh-water area. They cut the inland waterway in a certain project in North Carolina that nobody asked for. They cut it from a salt-water body to a fresh-water body. The prevailing winds drove the salt water through and it has damaged thousands and thousands of acres of fertile land. No correction can be had because they claim that to correct that condition, one they caused themselves, would be a new project. So the engineers do not recommend it to the budget. They did recommend it as an overall project, over the budget limitations.

Then, there is another project in North Carolina that I know of where a large storage grain mill was built on a 9-foot harbor, when the boats necessary to handle the grain draw 12 feet of water. That is an existing project. It has a maintenance operation on it, but the ships that carry the grain necessary for this kind of movement draw 12 feet of water and they cannot get in there to render the service. That is a port that is 95 miles from the nearest railroad. The engineers have been very gracious in putting a maintenance item in the bill for eastern North Carolina, known as the Rollinson Channel. That is 115 miles from any other mode of transportation.

Last year the North Carolina delegation had a great deal of trouble getting the Engineers to maintain it, an authorized existing project, to the project depth. The Engineers had moved all the funds from the State of North Carolina and were using them somewhere else.

So, Mr. Chairman, this bill can go down in history as a deep water ports project, as a large flood control and power project, with which I have no fuss. I am glad to support that. I think they should be supported, but I do think that some attention should be given to deserving, small, meritorious projects that come before the committee, which projects can be shown as meritorious.

I appeared before the committee on the two projects I spoke of, and not a member of the committee questioned the merit of either project; they all told me they were meritorious projects. But they stand on a principle which is probably correct; they will not do anything unless the budget recommends it, and the budget says they cannot do anything unless the Corps of Engineers recommends it. Now, I ask you who in the name of the Lord can do anything? If the small people of this country are deserving of a little crumb from the table, yet the entire budget limitation is given to the big projects, then where in the name of goodness is the little project to get anything?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the courtesy of this subcommittee in permitting constituents of mine and myself to appear and testify with reference to a serious flood which struck two towns in my district as a result of the overflowing of the Minnesota River, the towns of North Mankato and Mankato, Minn., the latter on the eastern bank of the river and the former on the western bank. The flood was of such proportions that the entire population of North Mankato, a town of 5,000 people, had to be removed from their homes, and about a thousand people were flooded out of their homes in Mankato. The result was about \$2,000,000 damage to private and municipal property, and in addition these cities have gone as far as they can and to the limit of their allowed public indebtedness in doing what they can to build dikes to protect against the river.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Minnesota appeared before our subcommittee on behalf of the Mankato and North Mankato projects; and he, particularly, made an outstanding presentation of the need for survey funds for that project.

Let me give the gentleman some information which I think will be helpful in expressing the congressional intent as set forth in our bill.

Mr. O'HARA. I would appreciate that.

Mr. FORD. The Army engineers, on pages 499 and 500, have set forth the projects where they would probably spend the money for surveys. Included in the projects, as the gentleman will see on page 500, is a request for \$25,000 for the Minnesota River, Minn. Mankato and North Mankato are on the Minnesota River in the State of Minnesota. It would appear from the testimony which was presented to us that certainly the most important area on the Minnesota River, the most urgent area, would be in the Mankato and North Mankato district. As a result, I believe that the gentleman can rest assured if the bill goes through as it is the Army engineers could find enough money in the amount allocated for surveys so that he will not have to worry about this worth-while project.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman use the words "should find" instead of "could find"? I would appreciate that very much because that is my problem.

Mr. FORD. I am sure that the gentleman from Minnesota, being the outstanding advocate he is, will have no difficulty whatsoever in convincing the Corps of Engineers of the absolute necessity of this project.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, as the Members know, 2 years ago, in 1950, a

certain amount was authorized and appropriated for a survey of water power resources up in New England. The survey was to be completed by 1954. Then there was some chance that in the future appropriations would be made for some water power projects.

But, unfortunately, this committee has just about cut the heart out of that program; therefore, it looks as if it is going to be many more years before New England will have an opportunity to share in the water power benefits that the other parts of the country are sharing in.

I have taken a look at the list prepared by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] of the States which are going to receive appropriations in this bill for these purposes. There are 26 of them. The State of Maine is not included among them, nor is the State of Vermont, nor is the State of Massachusetts, nor is the State of New Hampshire, nor is the State of Rhode Island. An appropriation of \$500,000 is made for Connecticut. It seems to me that the States of New England, should be considered.

We are asking \$300,000 in the rivers and harbors appropriation and a larger amount in the flood control portion so that we can carry on this survey. When the TVA appropriation came up, it was suggested by Members from the southeastern part of the country that we in New England should exploit our water power resources. We are anxious to do that, but we cannot do so if this survey is cut. Therefore I am going to ask that the money be restored so that we can get on with the job. It will be 3 or 4 years before we come in asking for any definite appropriation for particular project but, at least, we would like to carry on with the work.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. How much has the appropriation been cut?

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to the gentleman that there was a request for \$8,391,000. They gave only \$2,635,000 and of that \$2,150,000 is earmarked for fishery facilities, beach erosion, and so forth. The remaining \$435,000 must be divided up for surveys in different parts of the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I am for that survey and the development of the water power. The States that the gentleman mentioned have no coal, no gas, no oil, and very little wood. Raw materials are extremely scarce. Of all sections of the country that needs to have its water power developed it is that area, and I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman. The result is that for power we pay twice as much as in Chattanooga and we would like to see if we can do something about it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, page 6, line 15, of the bill states:

For construction of authorized flood-control projects or parts thereof and for other

related activities as may be authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$206,017,400.

I have consulted with members of the subcommittee on my side and it is indicated to me that about 80 percent of the \$206,000,000 is not for flood control. It is for the development of hydroelectric power. Now, for goodness sake, gentlemen, if you want to talk about flood control, then let us talk about flood control and appropriate for flood control and not kid ourselves into thinking that \$206,000,000 in this bill set up for flood control is for flood control, because only about 20 percent of it, or \$40,000,000, can actually be said to be for flood control. I think it is a shame to try to fool the people of the United States into thinking we are appropriating \$206,000,000 for flood control when we are not doing anything of the kind.

I might point out that we have a genuine flood-control project in my part of the country that has been under construction for 16 years. Mr. Engel, when he was chairman of this subcommittee some years ago, said that all flood-control projects that are started should be completed in 5 years. That project in Los Angeles County still has nearly \$200,000,000 to go toward completion. If it were to be completed in the next 5 years you would be appropriating \$40,000,000 in this session of the Congress for it. And what do we get? Two million eight hundred and ninety-eight thousand dollars. At that rate, gentlemen, the Los Angeles County flood-control project—and there is no hydroelectric power in it—will be going on for another 60 years. Now, for goodness sake, if the Congress does not want to complete this project, then let us drop the whole thing and let Los Angeles County do it. Someone has to get along with the work. We are contributing our part of it. We pay one of the highest tax bills in the United States and we pay all of our proportionate share of these flood-control moneys in the purchasing of land and so forth. But, if you gentlemen are going to piddle along with this project at this rate, then get out from under and let someone go to work that wants it. That is all I want to say.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that we only have a few minutes remaining, but these minutes are very important to me, and I should like for the committee to listen because I shall be brief.

The lower Mississippi was allowed \$59,605,000. I have the very highest respect and regard for all of the members of the subcommittee handling this bill on both sides of the aisle, but I must very frankly state to them that they have really cut me a "frock" in this particular reduction.

In allowing \$59,000,000 to the lower Mississippi, the report contains this statement:

The reduction is achieved mainly by denying the funds requested in the amount of \$665,000,000 for the construction of a sanitary sewer for the Memphis Harbor project in the belief that this item is not properly

a charge against the Federal Government and should be borne by the local interests.

Now that puts the name of Memphis very definitely on this very nominal reduction. This project covering the Memphis Harbor was authorized under a public law of 1946, and that provision includes the improvement of the Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tenn., substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 12, 1946.

This harbor project located in Memphis, midway between Chicago and New Orleans, is on a very strategic part of the Mississippi River which bears a tremendous amount of river traffic. This project will cost the city of Memphis \$28,000,000. It has been under way since 1947. We had an island and the water flowed around both sides. It was necessary to put a closure dam at the north end of the island and across that closure will be a highway and railroad connections. Nine hundred and sixty acres of industrial land, very important to the city of Memphis and to the mid-South, and to the Nation will be developed as a result.

This project requires the building of a sanitary sewer. Under the rules which have prevailed for many, many years, in the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Government will build the sewer to take care of the sewage which has been collected by the local authorities, and then they take it away to the main channel of the river. The sewer which exists now pours into this still water, made still by the closure dam, and you do not have any water in any stream to take the sewage down into the main stream of the river.

This sewer project was recommended by the district engineer of Memphis, recommended by the president of the Mississippi River Commission, according to the requirements of law came up to the Corps of Engineers, and was recommended by the Chief of Engineers and transmitted to the Congress through the proper channels of the Secretary of War. The public law in 1946 made this provision for the extension of the existing sanitary sewer from its outfall near Nonconah Creek to the lower Mississippi River at the lower end of the Tennessee chute.

If the men on the committee feel that it is a proper charge against local interests they are seeking to undo what was presented to and passed by both Houses of the Congress, signed by the President, and became a part of the public law of 1946. So I feel that this small item of \$665,000 certainly should be included.

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

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For carrying out the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers as provided in the various flood control and rivers and harbors acts and other acts applicable to that agency, as follows:

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

Mr. Chairman, because I could not get any time to speak in general debate, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as others have said before me, that personally I admire and think a great deal of the men on both sides who compose this subcommittee. My admiration and regard would be even higher had I been able to get the projects in this bill that I had hoped for. But, regardless of that, I know they have a job to do, and I know it is a hard job. In some respects it is not a very pleasant job for them.

On the other hand, I think it is fair that I call to the attention of the House two projects that I think do need some sort of explanation from the subcommittee and an explanation to the House. The first one, which I mentioned, is called the Natchitoches project. I mentioned that in questions I asked my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I want to say a little bit myself regarding that project. This project is not within my own district. It is in the Red River watershed, it is true. Not a cent which is appropriated for the lower Mississippi goes into the Red River watershed. We are entirely separated from the Mississippi River. We have a stream 1,300 miles in length, and all the flood control and help we get, if any, would be entirely independent from the lower Mississippi Valley. Our problems are different and unique.

The Natchitoches project is a water-diversion project. That is, when the Red River is high and you have a flood condition, by simply a slight diversion project below Natchitoches, in Louisiana, we could drain a large part of the flood waters off into a stream called Cane River. Cane River is an old bed of the Red River. By a small expenditure we can protect 135,000 acres of rich alluvial land in that section of the State of Louisiana, the whole project at a total estimated cost of \$1,835,000, which is a pitifully small amount compared to the vast sums we have been spending and sending overseas. It has an estimated justification with the engineers of 1.58 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, here is the important part about this project:

This project—

And I am going to read from the testimony of General Chorpene before the subcommittee—

is a local flood-control project consisting of levees, dams, flood gates, and a channel. The funds requested this year in the amount of \$500,000 will be applied to the dam, flood gates, and channel entirely, the levee having been built with funds appropriated in previous years.

Then he says further on in reply to a question asked of him by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR:

This project is 62 percent completed with the funds received this year, and will be 80 percent completed with the funds we are asking for the year 1953.

This project has been approved by the engineers, and is almost completed, yet there is nothing whatsoever in the bill in reference to funds. I pause here because I have ample time, and I have discussed this with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan who indicated that he would be glad to make a statement on this project. So, I pause now for my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to make some statement, if he cares to, in reference to this particular project, which will be 89 percent completed if the funds were allowed.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is referring to Natchitoches?

Mr. BROOKS. I say again, it is not in my district, but it is vital to the lower Red River Valley.

Mr. RABAUT. The project is deleted. This was an unbudgeted project put in by the Senate last year. It was not in the budget then. It represents the completion of a project, which has actually been delayed for over 8 years. It was asked for this year by the Army engineers.

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentleman, the engineers did ask for it last year?

Mr. RABAUT. It was not in the budget.

Mr. BROOKS. It was not in the budget, but it is in the budget this year, and the engineers asked for it too, and on this amount of money it would be 89 percent completed.

Mr. RABAUT. We figured inasmuch as it had been delayed 8 years, and with the war situation, it would not hurt to delay it another year.

Mr. BROOKS. While the gentleman is on his feet, may I ask him a question with reference to this Red River stabilization project which covers an area 400 miles below the Denison Dam to the mouth of the Red River for bank stabilization. That was also approved by the Army engineers, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I talked to General Chorpene less than 30 minutes ago, and he said it was a critically needed project, and that they were very anxious to have it allowed.

Mr. RABAUT. The completion date for it is set for 1959 so you can see that is quite a ways off. The construction was initiated in 1948.

Mr. BROOKS. If the funds had been allowed this year, as they were requested, it would be 47 percent completed. As it is, I think now with the funds that the committee has already granted, it is 40 percent completed. We are down there in the bottom of the valley, subject to floods, and are most anxious that the project be completed.

Mr. RABAUT. Such a long construction period for a project of this size shows that it is relatively unimportant, and certainly without defense significance. As further evidence of this fact, no funds were even requested for the project for the fiscal year 1952. As a matter of fact, information supplied the committee by the Corps of Engineers shows that the plans for the work contemplated in 1953 are only 60 percent completed while those for the remainder of the project are only 40 percent complete. Now, we

have a long statement here on this and I can supply it for the RECORD although I do not want to take it out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BROOKS. What the gentleman has said is adequate and I thank the gentleman very much.

May I say to the chairman of the committee that General Chorpene said on page 283 of the testimony "that the defense significance is that we have a very considerable transportation network in the Red River Basin, together with many industrial plants, large food and fiber production areas and important military installations, such as the Lone Star and Red River Ordnance works near Texarkana, and the Barksdale Air Force Base and Louisiana Ordnance works near Shreveport."

Then, on page 284, it goes on to say how vital that is, and he sets forth the projects that are of defense significance, that will be held up by the completion of that project. I am going to put those in the RECORD as they appear on pages 283 and 284 of the record so that the House and the country can see that each project will cost but very little money, but which mean so much to both sides of the river from Denison, Tex., south to the mouth of the river.

Mr. Chairman, in completion of what I have to say, I want to say that we had the most disastrous flood in the Red River in 1945. All of the money that has been appropriated and will be appropriated on this particular project will never come up to one-tenth of the damage we suffered from that flood in 1945 along the Red River Valley. When I say there is not a penny for bank stabilization on the Red River, there is only one single project approved on the Red River below Denison, Tex. If there comes another flood, our people in the Red River Valley will pay for the fact that we have not been able to complete the levees at critical areas, as strongly recommended by the Army engineers in the testimony before the committee. I have a high regard for the members of the subcommittee, but I think they have grievously erred in practically excluding the Red River Valley from relief under this act.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has referred to the relative importance of the Red River levee and bank stabilization project and I am asking that the testimony, with questions and answers, between himself and General Chorpene, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers in charge of civil functions, be reproduced below, together with the material which was furnished the committee at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. It shows the vital importance of this project and its extreme importance from the viewpoint of national defense. And I read it:

RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STABILIZATION BELOW DENISON DAM, ARK., TEX., AND LA.

Mr. RABAUT. The next project is the Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La.

This is a project with a total estimated Federal cost of \$9,088,000. Allotments to date are \$3,620,900. There was no appropriation in 1952. The tentative allocation for

fiscal year 1953 is \$634,000. This project at the close of 1952 will be 40 percent completed. It has remained at that percentage now for some time. The money requested for fiscal year 1953, namely, \$634,000, would bring the rate of completion to 47 percent. Make a brief general statement on this project.

General CHORPENING. This project is a major component of the comprehensive plan for flood control on the Red River below Denison Dam, and includes the construction of levees and bank protection works for flood control and to prevent the erosion of the banks of the river, which endangers the levees that are in place that have been built at Federal and local expense. These levees protect some highly developed areas in that part of the country.

I may say that the Red River in its characteristics of erosion is quite similar to the Arkansas River and to the Missouri River, which we have discussed at some length in these hearings; and we have a similar problem existing here. The \$634,000 which is being requested for this fiscal year will be entirely devoted to the construction of additional bank protection works along stretches of the river where, unless this is done, set-backs of levees would have to be made.

Mr. KERR. Is this river a tributary of the Mississippi?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir. You will recall on our trip down the Mississippi River, the Red River comes in at what is known as Old River just above the Morganza structure.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the defense significance of this project?

General CHORPENING. The defense significance is that we have a very considerable transportation network in the Red River Basin, together with many industrial plants, large food and fiber production areas, and important military installations such as the Lone Star and Red River ordnance works near Texarkana, and the Barksdale Air Force Base and Louisiana ordnance works near Shreveport.

Mr. RABAUT. What particular projects will be protected by the work that is contemplated in this estimate?

General CHORPENING. I would like to furnish that specific information for the record.

Mr. RABAUT. All right, furnish it for the record.

(The material to be furnished is as follows:)

"McNeely cut-off: Bank protection work is needed for McNeely cut-off to maintain the integrity of the controlling levee. Continued caving would result in destruction of the levee. Destruction of the levee during overbank stages would flood approximately 20,000 acres of land, 10,000 of which is cropland. In addition, the main line of the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroad, and United States Highway No. 71, both important transportation arteries, would be flooded.

"Curtis location: Bank protection works at Curtis are needed to prevent destruction of the controlling levee and to provide a favorable channel alignment. Destruction of the levee during overbank stages would flood approximately 32,000 acres of land, of which 10,000 is cropland. In addition, the main line of the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroad and United States Highway No. 71 would be inundated, thus interrupting traffic on these main transportation arteries. Barksdale Field would also be affected by backwater. If caving is permitted to continue a channel alignment detrimental to the bank stabilization works at Lucas Bend, downstream from the Curtis location, would result. Lucas Bend stabilization works were constructed to prevent destruction of the Texas & Pacific Railroad and Louisiana State Highway No. 30, both important transportation arteries to Shreveport and Barksdale Field.

Coushatta: Bank protection works are needed at the town of Coushatta to protect the improvements adjacent of the river bank and to the highway bridge valued at \$1,000,000. Limited bank protection works were constructed during fiscal year 1951 with emergency funds and local contributions to protect the bridge abutments. Failure to arrest caving would result in a loss of existing bank protection works.

Cash Point: Bank protection work is necessary for the Cash Point location to prevent a levee set-back which would result in the relocation of the Texas & Pacific Railroad and United States Highway No. 71. A failure of the levee would destroy these transportation arteries in addition to flooding approximately 22,000 acres of land of which 9,000 is cropland.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Mr. RABAUT. Why were no funds allocated for this work in fiscal 1952?

General CHORPENING. There was a small amount of carry-over funds from previous years which were being expended and no funds were allowed in the budget.

Mr. RABAUT. I ask that question because of the fact that you say it seems necessary now for the defense effort, and last year no funds were allocated for this work.

General CHORPENING. That is correct. There were none allocated last year, but about \$74,300 will be obligated in fiscal year 1952 from prior funds.

REQUEST FROM BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. FORD. What did the Corps of Engineers request in the budget for fiscal year 1952?

General CHORPENING. \$360,000 in fiscal 1952.

Mr. FORD. What did the Corps of Engineers request this year in the budget for fiscal year 1953?

To show the extreme importance of the Natchitoches, La., project, I am setting forth below the testimony taken January 29, 1952, and reproduced on pages 395 and 396 of the hearings covering this project. I do so to show the project is 62 percent completed at the present time and with the additional funds requested by the Budget and the Army engineers for the current year, it would be 89 percent completed. We are losing much money by not completing this project. This testimony I am interested in, I read to the House:

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1952.

NATCHITOCHES PARISH, LA.

Mr. RABAUT. We will take up Natchitoches Parish, La.

This is a project with a total estimated Federal cost of \$1,830,000. The allotments to date have been \$1,129,100, and the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1952 was \$360,000. The tentative allocation for fiscal year 1953 is \$500,000. This project as of the close of 1952 will be 62 percent complete, and with the money requested for fiscal year 1953 the rate would rise to 89.

General Chorpining, we will be glad to have you tell us about this project.

General CHORPENING. This is a local flood-protection project, consisting of levees, dams, floodgates, and a channel. The funds requested this year in the amount of \$500,000, will be applied to the dam, floodgates, and channel entirely, the levees having been built with the funds appropriated in previous years.

The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.1 to 1. There has been an increase in cost of \$70,000 over the previous estimate. This increase in costs is due entirely to price level changes.

Mr. RABAUT. Which is within the cost index increase?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Mr. KERR. This project is 62 percent completed?

General CHORPENING. It will be 62 percent completed with the funds received this year, and will be 89 percent completed with the funds that we are asking for fiscal year 1953.

Mr. FORD. This project was not included in the budget for the fiscal year 1952; we had no hearings, and there was no mention of it as being an urgent project. Did the corps request it over in the Senate at the time of the hearings over there for the fiscal year 1952?

General CHORPENING. No, sir.

Mr. FORD. I think that is understandable, when you see the benefit-to-cost ratio was 1.1 to 1. Do you have any idea how it got in the bill last year over in the Senate?

General CHORPENING. I believe that the local interests were heard by the Senate Appropriations Committee and that the Senate concluded it was a meritorious project that should be included in the appropriation.

Mr. FORD. What is the story about the conflict among the local interests, which has extended over a period close to 10 years?

General CHORPENING. I believe that there was a difference of opinion as to where the dam and floodgates were to go, which differences were finally resolved among the local people; they are now satisfied and they testified that they were in agreement, I believe.

ANNUAL BENEFITS

Mr. FORD. What is the annual benefit to be derived from this project?

General CHORPENING. The annual benefits are estimated at \$104,500. It is primarily a local flood-control project, including levees along the Red River to keep the water of the Red River off approximately 135,000 acres of land and the improvement of the channel at the lower end. We are asking funds for the improvement of the channel to carry the water out of the Cane River down to a point approximately 5 miles below the end of the levee and discharge it into the Red River.

BENEFIT-TO-COST RATIO

Mr. FORD. I understand the benefit-to-cost ratio at the time of the hearings last year before the Senate committee was 1.58 to 1. According to the justification this year it is 1.1 to 1. How do you account for the rather substantial decrease in the benefit-to-cost ratio?

General CHORPENING. I would like to look into that and place a statement in the Record.

(The information requested follows:)

"The benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.58 to 1 used in connection with the 1952 budget was based on consideration of the project as an individual unit within the over-all plan for the Red River below Denison Dam. The benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.1 to 1 considers the project as a feature of the over-all plan. The present benefit-to-cost ratio which would be comparable to last year's ratio of 1.58 to 1 is 1.73 to 1."

PROGRESS OF WORK

Mr. FORD. I understand, according to the justifications, the dam, floodgates, and channel have not as yet been started, and the \$500,000 requested for the fiscal year 1953 is for that purpose.

General CHORPENING. No, sir; the \$360,000 allotted in 1952 will be applied toward the initiation of that work; the \$500,000 requested for fiscal year 1953 will be applied to the continuation of that work.

Mr. FORD. Has a contract been let for the dam, floodgates, and channel for fiscal year 1952?

Mr. BOUSQUET. No, sir; it is scheduled for award in April of 1952.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make a short statement.

It is the ambition of the leadership of the House and of the committee to complete this bill tonight. There are about 75 different projects in this bill that could be discussed. In justice to the time and the individual members of the committee, I am bringing this to your attention. We can sit here as long as we care to, but I would appreciate it very much, and I think most of the Members present would appreciate it, if we tried to confine our talks to 5 minutes. If there is some highly controversial matter in the bill, we will have to arrange for time on it. I simply wanted to make this statement so that the membership would be informed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the report states that \$1,215,000 have been set aside for survey work. That is somewhat misleading, because the amount of \$1,215,000 for surveys contains functions other than surveys of projects on resolutions from the Public Works Committee.

In the items of work to be covered by this appropriation are the Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers, the New England-New York area surveys; stream-gaging stations are to be maintained; the rainfall stations are to be maintained.

Storm studies, flood investigations, and items of fish and wildlife study are carried out by the Department of the Interior; all these functions will be expected to continue from the amount of \$1,215,000, in addition to survey works of flood control. There can be little survey works for this amount.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], speaking in general debate, stated in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that they wanted the work of surveys to go on in the Great Lakes because of the unusual water situation prevailing there at the present time. He neglected to tell you that under the Joint International Commission such work has to be carried out from the appropriation for surveys, \$600,000 as contained in the rivers and harbors survey work. Why do we talk about wanting these surveys in the Great Lakes when we do not have money to carry out those investigations or making surveys in the State of New York?

The gentleman said a great deal about the survey work that was being carried forward on the great streams of this country and that we are making vast investments in the streams producing power. Is there anything unusual about developing the hydroelectric potential of the Columbia Valley? Is there anything unusual about the fact that the water flow in the Mississippi River is such size that it attracts our attention? Is there anything unusual about the greatness of the Great Lakes? Naturally they are

going to require a larger proportion of the investment because they give the greatest return, so it does not mean that we are neglecting the smaller streams. We need to give greater attention to them, but we must invest, and make wise investments, in the big streams that can produce the energy necessary to meet the growing and expanding economy of America; and I cannot visualize, for the life of me, how we can be so neglectful as not to provide the funds necessary to carry on a program to make inquiries of investing funds to protect people. But a lot of people like to call items in the bill such as this "pork barrel." Is there anything wrong with the Federal Government sensing a responsibility to keep water off of the lands, to prevent inundations, to protect life and property? I submit to you that we need more funds to carry out public works in flood-control and river and harbor projects.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS
EXAMINATION, SURVEY, PLANNING, AND OTHER
STUDY PROGRAMS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed rivers and harbors projects; including preliminary examinations and surveys; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized rivers and harbors projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; to remain available until expended, \$2,635,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys and plans and specifications shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756) and the act of August 14, 1946.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$2,635,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,635,000."

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, the committee has allowed for surveys and planning of rivers and harbors projects all over this country the sum of \$635,000, a sum so wholly inadequate that it is a matter for wonder that the appropriation was not wholly eliminated. My amendment adds \$1,000,000 which, very frankly, will not do much good, but is offered more or less in the nature of a test as to whether the House is really willing to discontinue this program entirely so that the money can be saved for the support of construction projects everywhere else in the world except in America.

I must associate myself with the earlier expressions of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and the gentleman

from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]. The country is tired of hearing that we can afford to spend \$2,500,000,000 on Greece since the end of the war; that we can afford to build irrigation plants all over Indochina and propose to help some 15,000 villages there; that we can afford to support the construction of school buildings in Turkey, and in short can afford to support the rest of the world in a style to which they have not been accustomed, and still are unable to afford a relatively small sum for the planning of works, which will have to be undertaken some day soon if the economy of large parts of this country is to survive.

This business of eliminating all present and future projects in the guise of emergency simply means that we will never undertake the projects, because there is always an emergency. My people are tired of hearing about the improvement of the Rhone River in France. They want to hear a little bit more about improvement of rivers and harbors here at home, which are vital to our economy even though they contribute nothing to the economy of Timbuktu.

For the want of a few thousand dollars spent in southern New Jersey, important business is disappearing and American lives are lost as a result of the deterioration of inlets. I am not presently suggesting that we start at once on a much needed construction program, but I am suggesting that we require now to plan for work that will have to be done in the immediate future.

A fine area of New Jersey, which pays a very full share of Federal taxes, will suffer if we continue to concentrate on the improvement of foreign economies to the detriment of our own.

It is very unpopular to suggest any increase, no matter how small, in an appropriation bill at this time. I do not hesitate to do so because if you will join with me, we will save ten or fifteen billion dollars before this session is over, and thus can well afford the additional million which I am suggesting for your consideration.

Let this small amendment be a test of whether we are willing to spend all of our money abroad, or whether it is not time to spend at least a small part of it at home.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments to the amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the committee included the amount of \$625,000 for river and harbor studies and \$1,215,000 for similar work for flood control. The chief purpose of these survey funds is to provide the necessary money for surveys for unauthorized projects so that they may become authorized, and add to the mounting list of projects in the civil works program of

the Corps of Engineers. The total estimated cost of this program is already almost \$14,000,000,000. If you appropriate funds for the authorized programs it would require \$14,000,000,000. Where would you be with the economy bloc then?

The committee has urged the Corps repeatedly to reevaluate their program and remove the dead wood. Efforts in this respect have resulted in projects valued at only \$1,500,000,000 being placed on an inactive list.

The committee has allowed sufficient funds to carry out surveys that are vital to the defense needs of the country. Until the time the Corps of Engineers has made further progress on the presently authorized programs the committee fails to see the need for additional funds.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman if these funds could not be used for that survey of the Great Lakes that has been referred to here today?

Mr. RABAUT. The item for survey, of northern and northwestern lakes, is not carried in this item. The gentleman will not put me on the spot by referring to the Great Lakes.

Mr. RANKIN. I think they could be so used.

Mr. RABAUT. Fourteen billion dollars has been authorized. I want the Members of the committee to realize the tremendous authorizations that this House from time to time votes.

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

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

Mr. WERDEL. Can the gentleman give us the estimated cost of the projects that have been commenced; that is, where construction has been commenced as distinguished from those that have been authorized?

Mr. RABAUT. Projects under construction at the present time total \$5,950,000,000. We are not playing around here with peanuts. These are tremendous sums. The situation that we are in is not due to the engineers. It is due to the things that we do in this House. Then you put the responsibility upon the Committee on Appropriations that must come in here and present the matter to you. The thing that surprises me is the action of the economy bloc that we have in the House. The Members from the economy bloc on both sides of the aisle were in the majority to come before our committee to want something for their own districts. "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel."

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman realizes that since the war we have only appropriated approximately \$5,000,000 annually for survey work. Now, if there has been any error made it certainly would seem that we have been in error in appropriating \$38,500,000,000 for

work of which your committee has authorized not a single day's work to be done on one of the projects. It seems like the better investment would be to have surveys.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I have heard the arguments made here today by Members representing States along the Great Lakes who are appealing for funds for surveys. I want to know if this money could be used for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that to be a parliamentary inquiry. An inquiry of that nature should be addressed to the chairman of the committee.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: Page 4, line 14, after "expended" strike out "\$2,635,000" and insert "\$2,935,000, of which \$300,000 shall be expended for the New England-New York survey."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I made reference before to the request of the New England States for certain moneys to survey our water-power resources. You are all familiar with the fact that, in New England, particularly Massachusetts, in some of our large textiles and shoes centers, we have been suffering from a severe recession, and one of the reasons for this is the high cost of power. We have to pay for power, both industrial and private, about twice as much as they pay for a similar amount of power in the Tennessee Valley and in the Northwest. In 1950, at the President's request, a certain amount of money was set aside for a survey. The report was supposed to be completed in 1954 and thereafter in 1955 and 1956 we expected to take some action on certain projects which would enable us to develop our water-power resources, and thereby reduce the cost of our power. The budget requested this year for rivers and harbors for the New England survey, \$300,000; for flood-control survey, \$800,000; making a total of \$1,100,000. Unfortunately the committee has chosen to cut both of these appropriations. The engineers have informed me this morning that due to the amount of the cut it would probably be impossible to carry on their surveys for another year. It is going to mean postponement of the results of the survey certainly until 1955 or 1956 at the soonest, even if the House takes action favorably next year. Therefore, I am asking for an additional appropriation of \$300,000, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, to be put onto the amount the committee has set aside.

On page 4, line 14, the committee has appropriated \$2,635,000. The difficulty is that at least \$2,000,000 of that is set

aside for fisheries and \$135,000 is set aside for another project, leaving only about \$400,000 for surveys to cover the entire country.

Therefore I hope this Committee will take favorable action on this request for another \$300,000 to carry on the New England survey. We really depend on this money. If this money is not forthcoming, we are really going to be in serious trouble.

There are large appropriations for nearly 26 States. The State of Oregon alone has \$86,000,000 in this bill. Year after year since 1935 large sums of money have been appropriated for a good many of the States in this country, particularly in the Southeast United States and in the Northwest. New England has not gotten anything. Not 1 cent of money is appropriated in any of this bill for five of the six New England States.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has pointed out, I feel that we are dependent upon the importation of all of our fuel, coal, oil, and natural gas. We have not gone ahead and developed our water-power reserves. We have been at fault. Now we are trying to do it, and just in the middle of the attempt, while we see some results in sight, this committee has chosen to postpone our hopes for at least another year.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. Who is asking for this appropriation?

Mr. KENNEDY. The New England States are asking, the Governors and the New England Congressmen, I believe.

Mr. NICHOLSON. There is one New England Congressman that is not.

Mr. KENNEDY. I regret that the gentleman feels that way.

Mr. NICHOLSON. One reason we are paying high power costs is that we are building dams in the Tennessee Valley and the Missouri Valley and every other valley to go in business against private enterprise.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not want to see it happen in New England.

Mr. KENNEDY. An appropriation passed this House of around \$174,000,000 for TVA. There are also large appropriations for the west coast. Does the gentleman object to our getting \$300,000 for all the New England States for a survey of our waterpower resources?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, but I object to paying \$174,000,000 for the TVA.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do, too. It does seem to me that if the money is going to go there we certainly should expect to receive at least \$300,000 to carry on our survey. I know the gentleman is interested in lowering the cost of our power.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman if he will help get the Governors and General Court of Massachusetts and the New Hampshire Legislature to the compact between New Hampshire and Massachusetts so that

we can do more in the development of flood control with the dams than is being done at the present time? It is very important. I think we ought to throw that back to the Governors and get them to do something. I agree with the gentleman that we should have the surveys, but the States should act on the much-needed compacts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The survey must come before we do anything. Unfortunately, we must wait for a long time, 1955, even if this money is appropriated, before the results of the survey become known.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the people of Massachusetts getting cheaper power. I think perhaps we ought to have a little cheaper power. But, we cannot get it right away because private enterprise has taken care of the rural districts to the extent of 98 percent in Connecticut and in Rhode Island, and about 95 percent in Massachusetts. So, we have not had to ask for any REA funds or for any valley projects. So far as I know, the people who want these surveys made, and have electric power generated go along with this fallacy that the Government can do it better than private enterprise can. Let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman, if it was worthwhile to build these plants, private enterprise would have done it long ago. It is about time, I think, for the Congress to find out that we can run our own business in our own community, and in our own States without any fatherly advice from the Federal Government. It is pretty near time that we put our foot down because the answer is obvious. We owe \$270,000,000,000 and we have a \$14,000,000,000 deficit. Now we are trying to sell this idea to the people of New England. I was in the legislature a long time, and I never saw any governors ask for this. I think some pressure may have been put on the Governor of Massachusetts to come here and ask for a survey. What good is a survey going to do, if we do not appropriate any money? The Committee on Public Works has obtained an authorization of something like five or six billion dollars. Why do we not take care of some of that five or six billion dollars before starting on any new construction, and on any new ideas?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] should be informed that at the present time there are 34 projects under construction in the 6 States to which he referred. There are 10 in Connect-

icut, 3 in Maine, 15 in Massachusetts, his own state, and 1 in Rhode Island, and 4 in New Hampshire, and 1 in Vermont. The argument against this amendment is the same as I made against the preceding amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote, and ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of authorized rivers and harbors projects or parts thereof and for other related activities as may be authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$117,710,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 5, line 5, strike out "\$117,710,000" and insert in lieu thereof "including \$2,000,000 for planning and construction of the Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), \$119,710,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are asking for a small appropriation to complete the planning and begin the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, which has already been authorized by Congress, and on which something like \$800,000 has already been spent on the planning, which is just about complete.

It is the only possible way to provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., as well as to all points on the Tennessee, upper Mississippi, and the Missouri Rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

It will mean more to the States of Kentucky, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia, and western Pennsylvania than anything else of its kind that has ever been proposed.

It will mean more to the States of Missouri, Kansas, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and all the other States in the Middle West, and along the Great Lakes, than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

There is not another place on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. The only other one that even approximates it is the connection between the Don and Volga Rivers in Russia, which has just been constructed with lend-lease machinery, paid for by American people. If you want to practice economy at home and deny to our people the use of their own resources and continue to impose this burden upon the American people to finance similar projects abroad, you certainly are not going to get my support.

If this project were in some foreign country we would probably have no trouble in getting funds to complete it. I understand we have just spent \$130,000,000 of American money to build a power project in Italy, and now we are told that we are spending billions of dollars for a similar project in France, hundreds of millions of dollars for similar projects in Switzerland, to say nothing of the vast amounts being spent for that purpose in Israel, China, and other foreign countries, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States.

But this is an American project, and will benefit the American people more than any other development of its kind that has ever been undertaken. Therefore, we are told to wait indefinitely.

A fake hearing was perpetrated last year for the purpose of trying to discredit this project; and of all the misstatements I have ever read, they were poured into that record. One witness stated that in order to connect this project with the Tennessee River, you would have to cut a canal 170 feet deep and 39 miles long, and excavate 100,000,000 cubic yards of dirt. As a matter of fact, every well-informed engineer, who has investigated this project, knows that that statement is false. The truth of the matter is that the back waters of the Tennessee come within about 5 or 6 miles of where this project would connect with the main tributary of the Tombigbee. As I said, it will give you a slackwater route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Missouri, and the Tennessee Rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

There has never been a project proposed that will mean more to the people who pay the freight than this one will. At the very outside, it would not cost as much as one of these projects our people have just been paying for, and are still paying for, in foreign countries that are not contributing one dime to the welfare of the American people.

This is not a power project; it is for navigation only. It is just as sure to be constructed as the night follows the day; and the sooner it is finished the better it is going to be for that great section of the country extending from the Gulf to the Great Lakes and from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Rocky Mountains.

I appeal to you Members of Congress to give us this small amount, and not be wasting American money abroad, and at the same time denying appropriations that are necessary for the development of American resources. The greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil on which we live, is our navigable streams and their tributaries, and the sooner we develop them for the use of all the American people, the better it is going to be for the entire country.

At this point, I am inserting a statement which I made before the Senate committee 3 years ago, covering this entire proposition. I hope that every one of you will take the time to read and study it, and then help us to speed up the construction of this missing link in the

greatest inland waterway system in the world.

The matter referred to follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT ON TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS PROJECT

Representative RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning, let me say that I agree with the gentleman who have spoken on the Coosa-Alabama project.

I also want to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator Gurney, that I agree with him on the development of the Missouri Valley area. Recently, I checked up on that proposition, and found that the power that could be generated on the Missouri River and its tributaries would be a minimum of 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

Senator GURNEY. Congressman RANKIN, let me say that I have always been, since I have come to the Senate, a supporter of the north-bound channel of the barge line there that takes in Tombigbee. I feel that it is worth while.

Representative RANKIN. I know that and I am grateful, Senator. I remember your support of it all through the years, and I remember your statements for it on the floor of the Senate.

Now, let me say to you in the beginning that the Army engineers say they would like to have \$5,000,000 to start this project now. I am not quoting anybody, individually, but that is what they say they would like to have to start with.

If this amendment is inserted in the Senate, I do not have the slightest doubt but that it will be retained in the House.

Let me show you where we are. I brought this map down to show you. You can see from those rivers there that it is almost a duplicate of this map except the lines are made heavier in order that you might more easily see what we have at stake.

Somebody said the other day that there is only a foot or two of water in this river. Where I am pointing is the confluence of Browns and Mackys Creeks, which join to form the Tombigbee about 25 miles from the Tennessee River. My father used to go to Walkers Ridge just below that point on a steamboat that came all the way from Mobile. There is a slight sand ridge between those two rivers, the Tennessee and the Tombigbee, and for more than a hundred years the Army engineers refused to approve this project, because they said they would have to have lifts both ways, and there was no water supply at the summit.

PICKWICK DAM

But in 1938, the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee just below the mouth of the Yellow Creek, and raised the water level 55 feet. The Army engineers made a new survey and came back and said that would solve the problem. They could cut through that sand ridge and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River.

That would give us a slack or still water route for returning or upstream traffic to the Tennessee River, and a downstream route from that point 215 miles to Paducah on the Ohio River or 262 miles to Cairo on the Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Members may have these figures before them, I am inserting three tables here as part of my remarks, which show the savings this project will provide.

As I said, they have been worked out by the Army engineers, and can be thoroughly relied on.

MULTIPLE PROJECT BENEFITS

Here is a table showing the cost per ton and the savings per ton this project will provide on the fuel bill alone, for upstream traffic:

Comparison of costs per ton of upstream traffic

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per ton	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per ton	Average savings per ton
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$2.02	\$1.32	\$0.70
	Paducah	2.10	1.26	.84
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.42	.99	1.43
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	.95	1.44
	Paducah	2.47	.89	1.58
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.79	.62	2.17
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	.95	2.01
	Paducah	3.04	.89	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.36	.62	2.74
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	.67	2.01
	Paducah	2.76	.61	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.08	.34	2.74
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	.51	2.32
	Paducah	2.91	.45	2.46
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.23	.17	3.06
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	.46	2.42
	Paducah	2.96	.40	2.56
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.28	.13	3.15
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	2.91	.44	2.47
	Paducah	2.99	.38	2.61
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.31	.11	3.20
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	.41	2.52
	Paducah	3.01	.35	2.66
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.33	.08	3.25

Here is a table showing the cost and the savings on a barge load or tow of 3,500 tons. I might say here, that except on the traffic from the larger cities such as Pittsburgh,

Chicago, and Detroit, a majority of the traffic, at least until recently, was handled by these 3,500-ton tows.

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 3,500 tons, and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 3,500 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$7,070	\$4,620	\$2,450
	Paducah	7,350	4,410	2,940
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	8,470	3,465	5,005
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	8,365	3,325	5,040
	Paducah	8,645	3,115	5,530
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	9,765	2,170	7,595
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	10,360	3,325	7,035
	Paducah	10,640	3,115	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,760	2,170	9,590
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	9,380	2,345	7,035
	Paducah	9,660	2,135	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	10,780	1,190	9,590
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	9,905	1,785	8,120
	Paducah	10,185	1,575	8,610
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,305	595	10,710
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	10,080	1,610	8,470
	Paducah	10,360	1,400	8,960
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,480	455	11,025
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	10,185	1,540	8,645
	Paducah	10,465	1,330	9,135
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,585	1,285	11,200
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	10,255	1,435	8,820
	Paducah	10,535	1,225	9,310
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,655	280	11,375

Here is another table which the Army engineers have worked out showing the cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons,

and also the savings which these barges would provide.

As I pointed out, these larger barges are being used more and more as time goes on.

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$28,280	\$18,480	\$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,490	13,300	20,190
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee—Continued

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	\$40,320	\$6,440	\$33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

Now let me show you what all this means.

Let us take the river systems that are affected by this project. Just forget us local people for the time being.

This bottleneck of our whole internal waterway system just happens to be in my district.

LOCKS AND DAMS

Now, there are 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River between Cairo and Pittsburgh. Then there are 13 locks and dams on the Monongahela and 8 on the Allegheny. All that traffic is simply stymied behind the swift current of the Mississippi River, so far as their returning, or north-bound traffic, is concerned.

In addition to that, on the upper Mississippi we have 26 locks and dams providing a splendid navigation channel all the way up to Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.

On the Illinois River we have seven locks and dams, extending our inland waterway system into the Great Lakes.

All those locks and dams together cost more than \$400,000,000, and yet they are virtually isolated for want of the very connection this project will provide.

On the Missouri River, a nine-foot channel is being developed up to Sioux City, Iowa. This project will be worth untold millions of dollars to the people of that area.

We get our grain from that section. The State of Mississippi, and I daresay the State of Alabama, raises no wheat. The same thing is true of Louisiana, Georgia, Tennessee, and all the other States in that part of the South.

They ship it down to us in barges. Those barges can come down the Mississippi flying, and so can these barges from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul; but when they start back here is the trouble. It is 869 miles from Cairo to New Orleans. That is the finest inland waterway in the world for downstream traffic, and the worst for upstream traffic.

You see, when that river is running $5\frac{1}{2}$ or 6 miles an hour your barges cannot move against it. All they can do is stand still and burn up gasoline. A barge only moves about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour in still water. We have an intercoastal waterway protected by a chain of islands here, extending all the way from Florida to the Mexican line. It is 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile along this intercoastal waterway—which, of course, is in slack or still water.

This Tombigbee inland waterway is already completed up to Demopolis, Ala., at the mouth of the Warrior River, where I am pointing on the map. Eighteen locks and dams are to be provided between Demopolis and the Tennessee River.

It will be 481 miles from Mobile up this Tombigbee route to the Tennessee River. That will be in still water, just as this is still water up the Ohio River behind those 47 locks and dams between Cairo, Ill., and Pittsburgh, Pa. When you get to the Tennessee River, it is downstream 262 miles to Cairo, Ill., or 215 miles to Paducah on the Ohio River.

So the traffic will come down the Mississippi River to New Orleans and then go across to Mobile along this intercoastal waterway, then back up this inland waterway to the Tennessee River, then downstream to Paducah, that is the traffic going up to the Ohio River, or downstream to Cairo for the traffic going to the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, or the Great Lakes.

This project was unhesitatingly approved by the Ohio Valley Improvement Association of which Mr. Walter M. Larence, of Cincinnati, I believe, is the chairman. He was down here the other day. When the Rivers and Harbors Congress met here, Mr. Larence was on the committee, and they put at the head of the projects they recommended this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

There is a firm in Pittsburgh that is engaged in the transportation business. They own a string of barges that come down the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers bringing materials produced in Pittsburgh, such as steel, farm machinery, and other manufactured products. When they go back they take oil, bauxite, sulfur, salt, lumber, cottonseed meal, and other materials they need.

This firm is tremendously interested, because they realize what it would mean for their returning traffic.

I am going to give you the figures on that in just a moment, but first I want to say one other thing.

Nobody need kid themselves; if we ever have another war, it is going to be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. The greatest defense project the world has ever known is the Oak Ridge project on the Tennessee River. This inland waterway will cut the water distance between Oak Ridge and New Orleans by 650 miles, and between Oak Ridge and Mobile by 806 miles, and at the same time give us two outlets to the sea instead of one.

In addition to that, it will give us a slack-water route into the Tennessee River and cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to the Tennessee by more than 75 percent or from \$2.79 to 62 cents a ton.

Now, I am going to take some of the barges they handle here, the big ones, because they are drifting rapidly toward the use of 14,000-ton barges.

DISTANCES INVOLVED

Senator STENNIS. Before you leave that, will you retrace your route there from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans and back to Cairo, and give us that mileage?

Representative RANKIN. Yes; let's take the traffic going downstream from Cairo, Ill. We will say a barge comes down the Missouri River, or down the upper Mississippi, or down the Illinois River, or down the Ohio River. They all come through Cairo.

Going from Cairo to New Orleans, you go downstream 869 miles. That is said to be the finest inland waterway on earth; and I think it is. I have never found one to equal it.

Then it is 156 miles across along the intercoastal waterway from New Orleans to Mobile. If I make a mistake, I want Colonel Jewett, the Army engineer who is sitting near me,

to correct me. I do not want to mislead the committee.

It is 481 miles from Mobile to the Tennessee River, of which portion 221 is already developed up to the mouth of the Warrior River at Demopolis.

When you get to the Tennessee River it is 215 miles downstream to Paducah on the Ohio, and 47 miles from Paducah down the Ohio River to Cairo.

In other words, the round trip is 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, 1,131 or approximately two-thirds of it is downstream, and the rest of it is in slack water. The Army engineers tell me—and I am quoting every engineer that has studied this question from General Reybold, General Feringa, General Wheeler, to our distinguished company here today, Colonel Jewett—they tell there is not another place on the face of the earth, nor can they find a place on the face of the earth where a project of this kind can be constructed so that you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

Now let us see what this project will mean. Let us take the 14,000-ton barges. Here is one (pointing to the picture on the map) coming down from Detroit, Mich. It is loaded with automobiles and accessories. It is evidently coming from Detroit. It is coming out of the Great Lakes down the Illinois River.

Here is one coming from Pittsburgh, Pa., loaded with the manufactured products of Pittsburgh.

Here is one over here that is coming, I believe, down the Missouri. I do not know what it is loaded with—probably with grain or beef or other products that those people out in that area produce.

Suppose that 14,000-ton barge gets to New Orleans, what does it cost to go back? If it goes back by way of the Mississippi River to Cairo, it will cost \$28,280 for its fuel bill alone.

Going back via Tombigbee and the Tennessee to Cairo the cost would be \$18,480, or a saving of \$9,800 on its fuel bill alone.

Senator GURNEY. That is about one-third. Representative RANKIN. That is about right.

Suppose it is going back to Pittsburgh or to Cincinnati or Wheeling or to any point on the Allegheny or the Monongahela, it would cut the cost from \$29,400 to \$17,640, saving \$11,760 on its fuel bill alone going back to the Ohio River.

Suppose it is going into the Tennessee; suppose we are in an emergency and it is going back to Oak Ridge, on the Tennessee River, it will cut the cost from \$33,880 to \$13,860, or a saving of \$20,020 on the fuel bill alone. That is from New Orleans to the Tennessee River.

Every 14,000-ton barge that goes into the Tennessee River from New Orleans via this route would save \$20,020 on its fuel bill alone, or two-thirds, as Senator Gurney said.

Suppose it is going from Mobile, carrying a load of that bauxite, we will say, that they are bringing in from South America, or salt or lumber or cottonseed meal, hulls, or oil, anything that they take back in those barges; going back from Mobile to Cairo, the cost would be reduced from \$33,460 to \$13,300 just on the fuel bill alone—a saving of \$20,160.

Now, that means every barge that is going not only to Cairo but to Chicago, any point on the Great Lakes or the upper Mississippi, all the way up to Minneapolis, St. Paul, or anywhere up the Missouri River to Sioux City, Iowa.

Suppose it is going the other way. We will say that it is going to Pittsburgh, Pa.

The fuel bill would be cut from \$34,580 to \$12,460, or \$22,120. That would be the saving on its fuel bill alone. That is a

14,000-ton barge going from Mobile to the Ohio River.

Suppose it is going into the Tennessee River; your cost would be cut from \$39,060 down to \$8,680, or a saving of \$30,380 on its fuel bill alone. That is for material, we will say, that is going to supply our defense plant at Oak Ridge or any other point on the Tennessee River.

Now, let us go a little further. We have this Tombigbee developed up to Demopolis. One of the things these barges takes back is oil. A man from Pittsburgh, talking to me the other day, said, "We are hauling this machinery and other manufactured articles down. We are hauling oil back."

One of the biggest oil fields that has been discovered in recent years is just to the west of Demopolis, Ala. The biggest oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi River was in Jasper County, Miss., about where I am pointing at this time. It produced a thousand barrels of oil a day, and I am told that no other well has ever been brought in east of the Mississippi that produced that amount.

By the way, this is the saving that the Birmingham traffic would enjoy, because every vessel from Birmingham has to come down the Warrior to Demopolis to go either way. These things I am referring to will apply to traffic going from Birmingham or Demopolis. Let us see what they amount to.

Going from Demopolis to Cairo, the cost will be cut from \$37,520 on one of these 14,000-ton barges to \$9,380, or a saving of \$28,140 on its fuel bill alone.

In other words, that barge going back to Detroit, Mich., would save \$28,140 on its fuel bill alone. That barge going to Pittsburgh would save \$34,440, or have its fuel bill cut from \$40,740 to \$6,300, a saving, as I said, of \$34,440 going from Demopolis to Paducah.

These figures are worked out by the Army engineers; they are not my figures.

If it were going into the Tennessee, supplying oil or other materials, we will say to the Oak Ridge project, the cost would be cut from \$43,120 to \$4,760, or a saving of \$38,360 on its fuel bill alone.

Now, you talk about water development, traffic transportation development, but nowhere else on earth can the same amount of money bring the same benefits to the people that this project will bring to the people of this vast area, all the Missouri River Valley, all the way up the Mississippi River, all the way up the Illinois into the Great Lakes and along the Great Lakes, all the way up the Ohio River to Cincinnati, Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and up the Monongahela or the Allegheny, and then along the Tennessee River all the way up to Oak Ridge or to Knoxville. There is not another project on earth, and there cannot be one found or constructed that will produce such benefits. The nearest we have ever found was a connection between the Don and Volga in Russia, and it does not have the benefit of the downstream traffic both ways for two-thirds of the distance.

The Senator from South Dakota asked what would happen to it if it went back to the House. I do not have the slightest doubt but that the House will sustain it. I have talked to many Members since this bill was up before. They say that, if the Senate gives us an appropriation for this project, it will be sustained in the House.

All we are asking is that you give us a reasonable amount. I would like to see you provide \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000. I think we ought to have that amount. The Army engineers could start with a smaller amount.

But I think it is imperative that we construct this project now as rapidly as possible.

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST

Senator THOMAS. What will it cost, all told?

Representative RANKIN. The latest estimate I see is \$116,000,000. Someone said that the advance in the cost of labor and

also the advanced cost of materials would probably run it up to \$136,000,000 all told.

By the way, they would employ 5,000 people, and we seem to be heading into unemployment in this country, in every section of it.

Senator ELLENDER. What size channel is that?

Representative RANKIN. Nine-foot channel with a 12-foot base, you understand, in the locks, so that if you wanted to increase it to 12, that could be done.

Senator ELLENDER. According to the figures you have just given us, I would assume that if goods are to be sent from Pittsburgh to Mobile, it would be more profitable to go by way of New Orleans.

Representative RANKIN. That is right.

Senator ELLENDER. Although there is about 200 miles difference.

Representative RANKIN. You can go from Pittsburgh to New Orleans without spending a nickel, if you go with the current, and that current is pretty fast after you reach the Mississippi. That stream sometimes runs 6 or 7 miles an hour. That traffic would go down the river, down the Mississippi River to New Orleans, and then it would go back through this slack-water route. In other words, the traffic would move counterclockwise.

Senator ELLENDER. You said there are several locks up there?

Representative RANKIN. Eighteen locks and dams between Demopolis and the Tennessee River.

PROPOSED CHANNEL WIDTH

Senator THOMAS. How wide would the channel be?

Representative RANKIN. I believe it is 170 feet.

Senator STENNIS. Is that large enough to take care of all normal traffic?

Representative RANKIN. Yes.

By the way, when this project was first before the Senate and the House, they recommended locks 75 feet wide and 475 feet long, and there was a good deal of complaint about it by people along the Ohio and the Illinois and the upper Mississippi for the simple reason that all the locks on those streams, and the locks at Pickwick and at Gilbertsville on the lower Tennessee, are 110 by 600 feet. So the Army engineers went back, made a new survey at the request of the Members of the House, and they have made these locks all 110 by 600 feet, so that they will carry all the traffic that can travel any of the rest of these streams.

Senator GURNEY. The only difference we would be short if we approved this \$136,000,000 project would be the difference between the 9-foot and 12-foot channel. We would later have to deepen it to 12 feet probably.

Representative RANKIN. We might do it, but we could do it; there would be no trouble about that.

The project has already been approved. It was approved in the Senate by a vote of 44 to 21 and by the House by a good majority, in 1946.

It is already written into the law.

Senator GURNEY. For a 9-foot or 12-foot channel?

Representative RANKIN. Nine foot with 12 feet over the sills so it can be deepened to 12 feet if necessary. That will put it as deep as the current stream along the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, and the intercoastal canal.

As I said, we people in my district will probably get no more benefit out of it than St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Minneapolis, or St. Paul. It will not only benefit all these areas here along these streams that are now seeking an outlet; the people on the Ohio River during last year, or 2 years ago, had a mass meeting to figure out some way to get an outlet to the sea.

Well, this will provide exactly what they are seeking.

Senator STENNIS. Will this 9-foot channel take care of all these barges about which you are talking?

Representative RANKIN. Yes; it will take care of every one of them.

Then, in addition to that, it will take care of all this traffic along the Great Lakes from Detroit and Cleveland. In addition to that, it will take care of the traffic along the Gulf of Mexico from Florida clear around to the border of Mexico. We have that Intra-coastal waterway that is protected behind a string of submerged islands, and these barges can go down and go either way. It simply completes the missing link in the greatest inland waterway system in the world.

I want to thank the committee for your kindness. I do not want to take up all your time. You have been very generous. We have some more gentlemen here who would like to be heard.

Senator ELLENDER. It has been most interesting.

Representative RANKIN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Congressman RANKIN.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment now close.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: On page 5, line 5, after the figure, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "of which \$436,000 shall be available for continuing work on Buffalo Harbor."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this body will see fit to support my amendment to restore to the Civil Functions appropriation bill the sum of \$436,000 for the Buffalo Harbor which was deleted in committee. Work on the harbor has been under way for approximately 17 years, being authorized by the act of August 30, 1935, and the funds asked for this year are for dredging the channel and removing the shoals in a portion of the southerly outer harbor.

This particular step is certainly justified on the basis of its importance to the national-defense effort if anything ever was. The channel is used to get ore and other materials into two steel plants, a large cement plant near the entrance, and for entrance inside of break wall to big cold-storage plant, the Ford plant and the city piers.

The dredging of this portion of the project to 25 feet will permit deep-draft vessels to traverse the outer harbor to the large industries. Bethlehem Steel is currently engaged in a \$175,000,000 plant expansion and will require deep-draft vessel operation from the outer harbor to supply sufficient raw materials to operate its expanded facilities to capacity. At the present time, the company is deepening and reconstructing

their ore and limestone terminals to accommodate vessels of 25-foot draft, and is also constructing two new Great Lakes ore carriers of 25-foot draft which they proposed to put in operation in the 1953 navigation season. The recommended deepening is necessary for full utilization of the expanded plant and terminal facilities and should be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

In 1950, Bethlehem received about 4,900,000 tons of iron ore and limestone at their plant, which quantities were about the largest that could be handled with their present facilities. After completion of their terminal reconstruction and from the Federal work proposed herein, they expect to be able to handle about 6,855,000 tons of iron ore and limestone. The benefit-to-cost ratio for the project, authorized August 30, 1935, is 3.36 to 1.

All the good business element of Buffalo is highly interested in this and, as I have already stated, the project is justified on the basis of its importance to the national-defense effort, also by a great reduction in transportation costs of bulk commodities. Commerce in 1950 was 16,698,672 tons, principally iron ore, coal, limestone, grain and petroleum products.

This is a highly worthy project and I hope you will support my amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the speech he has made. I am familiar with Buffalo Harbor; it is one of the great terminals where the large grain boats come and discharge the grain of the West into those elevators. If you choke that harbor you will destroy a great market there for a lot of western grain. The gentleman is quite right about the importance of this magnificent harbor in the defense effort. There is no reason to throttle that harbor in these perilous times.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the gentleman seeking to add that to the amount in the bill or is he simply asking that \$436,000 be earmarked for the further development of Buffalo Harbor?

Mr. BUTLER. It was in the budget but was taken out in the committee. What I ask is that it be restored.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I rise in support of this amendment.

The \$436,000 which is asked is about one-third of the cost of completing the outer harbor project at Buffalo. However, from the standpoint of tonnage, it would benefit more than two-thirds of all of the commerce using that area. The Bethlehem Steel Corp. recently spent \$12,000,000 on its canal and docks and has spent over \$100,000,000 in plant expansion. Unless this \$436,000 is granted, Bethlehem Steel will be un-

able to move its larger tonnages of ore with larger and deeper draft vessels.

We know that the national need for increased steel production is compelling and urgent. Since that is so, new and larger ships have been constructed for hauling ore on the Great Lakes, but these ships when fully loaded cannot gain entrance to the Bethlehem Steel plant located on the Lackawanna Canal unless this outer harbor project is completed.

This sum of \$436,000 is indeed a small investment in the interest of national defense that will accrue from the increased production and transportation of steel throughout the Great Lakes waterways.

The Bethlehem Steel plant is one of the three largest steel producing plants in the world, and is presently making a great contribution to the current defense program. For the Federal Government to grant certificates of necessity for prompt expansion of the steel producing facilities of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. in Buffalo on the one hand, and then to deny this appropriation which would prevent the utilization of those facilities, would be an economic and military catastrophe.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOULDER: Page 5, line 4, after the word "expended", strike out "\$117,710,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum of "\$121,710,000."

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 7268, now before the House for consideration, as reported and presented by the Committee on Appropriations, provides for the appropriation of the sum of \$117,710,000, to be expended in the construction of authorized rivers and harbors projects in various parts of the United States. According to the report of the Committee on Appropriations, only \$2,300,000 of that amount is earmarked for bank stabilization and levee construction on the Missouri River from "Kansas City to mouth," or the entire length or flow of the Missouri River across the State of Missouri, a total distance of approximately 386 miles.

My amendment, if adopted, will increase the appropriation to the extent of \$4,000,000, so as to provide for bank and levee construction on the Missouri River and its tributaries, as previously authorized by acts of this Congress. This increase from \$2,300,000 to \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1953 is absolutely essential for our national economy.

I consistently support economy in Federal expenditures when it is not detrimental to the people I represent in Congress. There can be no doubt of the need for flood control on the Missouri River and its tributaries. It is common knowledge that thousands of acres of our fertile farm lands are being washed away by river erosion and floods every

year. There is emergency need for stabilization of the channel of the Missouri River and its tributaries. It certainly is false economy to fail to appropriate sufficient money for repair and construction of levees and revetments to protect the homes and valuable productive farm lands of the Missouri River Basin. It is the most fertile and productive farming region in the world. It is the Nation's bread basket.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, surely there is no reasonable doubt for the need—a real emergency need—for repair and construction of additional bank stabilization and levee construction on the Missouri River Basin and its tributaries. The devastating floods during recent years on the Missouri, Osage, Blackwater-Lamine, Chariton, and Grand Rivers in Missouri are tragic evidence of such need not only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens but for the general welfare and preservation of our national economy and natural resources. The total property damage, to say nothing of the tragic loss of lives, resulting from the great flood last July alone exceeded \$1,000,000,000.

The United States Army engineers appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and requested \$8,500,000 for bank stabilization and levee construction on the Missouri River and its tributaries in the State of Missouri. The Bureau of the Budget reduced that request to \$3,500,000, but for reasons unknown the Committee on Appropriations further reduced that amount to \$2,300,000. The amendment which I offer provides for an increase of \$1,700,000 over and above the amount approved and presented here by the Committee on Appropriations, but it is less than one-half of the amount recommended by the Army engineers as necessary for the fiscal year of 1953 for bank stabilization and levee construction in Missouri.

If we continue to squander our resources on overseas or foreign civil construction functions or projects, and continue to neglect equally important, in fact, more important ventures in our own country, all democracy will ultimately pay the price of our neglect. The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for Congress and administration leaders to realize that the economic well being and military strength of our own America is as important to the forces of democracy as such strength in Europe.

I understand the arguments that have been made and propounded here by the committee that new projects should not be allowed and no money be appropriated therefor, but it is unusual that all projects in our own country are called new projects while money is being appropriated so liberally overseas for construction that are in fact new projects.

I also know that we are all for economy, but certainly it is not unreasonable to ask for an appropriation of money necessary to protect the lives and billions of dollars worth of property as well as the natural resources of our own country. It is false economy to do otherwise. We should and must provide for the needs of our own people.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently voted for economy in Federal expenditures but at the same time I have stressed the policy that in my judgment it is false economy, while we are spending billions of dollars overseas in the European and Asiatic countries to build up their public works of various kinds, to fail to spend the necessary moneys to preserve, develop, and utilize our own natural resources. This is particularly true of our water resources, development of rivers and harbors, construction of flood control works and the production of hydroelectric power, and

the conservation of our soil resources so that we may keep our production schedules going full capacity in this great crisis that confronts us.

In this bill I note that there is very little money appropriated for surveys and planning for flood control and river and harbor projects so essential to our economy. The committee, in my judgment, has taken a false position in assuming that because there is a large backlog of projects which have been approved that we should not keep up to date on surveys and planning, to provide for rivers and harbors and flood control to prevent the enormous devastation such as took place on the Columbia River in the past through the occurrence of floods. I am including an analysis of the bill we are now considering for surveys and planning, both for flood control and river and harbor development:

Analysis of House Appropriation Committee action on survey report and related program in civil functions bill for fiscal year 1953 (Mar. 27, 1952)

Line	Function and item	Flood control		River and harbor		Combined total	
		Budget estimate	Allowed by committee	Budget estimate	Allowed by committee	Budget estimate	Allowed by committee
1	General survey program.....	\$1,600,000	-----	\$600,000	-----	\$2,200,000	-----
2	2 special surveys:						
3	Arkansas-White-Red.....	1,000,000	-----	200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
4	New England-New York.....	800,000	-----	300,000	-----	1,100,000	-----
5	Subtotal.....	1,800,000	-----	500,000	-----	2,300,000	-----
6	Operation and miscellaneous:						
7	Stream-gaging stations.....	425,000	-----	70,000	-----	495,000	-----
8	Rainfall stations.....	500,000	-----	-----	-----	500,000	-----
9	Storm studies.....	500,000	-----	-----	-----	500,000	-----
10	Flood investigations.....	100,000	-----	-----	-----	100,000	-----
11	Fish and wildlife studies.....	40,000	-----	15,000	-----	55,000	-----
12	Subtotal.....	1,565,000	-----	85,000	-----	1,650,000	-----
13	Total, surveys and operation.....	4,965,000	\$1,215,000	1,385,000	\$485,000	6,150,000	\$1,700,000
14	Beach erosion studies.....	-----	-----	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
15	Planning, authorized projects.....	1,500,000	0	800,000	0	2,300,000	0
16	Construction, fish facilities.....	-----	-----	4,256,865	2,000,000	4,256,865	2,000,000
17	Subtotal, earmarked funds.....	1,500,000	0	5,206,865	2,150,000	6,706,865	2,150,000
18	Grand total (committee report, p. 15).....	6,465,000	1,215,000	6,391,865	2,635,000	12,856,865	3,850,000

The committee says that there are on hand unexpended funds in the amount of \$1,500,000 which may be used for planning and surveys. However, it should not be overlooked that this fund is tied up by order of the President so that no portion of it can be used until it is released by Executive order. As a result of this there will be no money available for surveys and planning for this important work.

I appeared before the subcommittee dealing with civil functions of the Defense Department urging that some funds be appropriated for flood control in the Columbia River area, which is of vital importance to my district. I called the committee's attention to several projects which have been authorized by the Congress and which are vitally necessary if we are to avoid another catastrophe such as occurred in 1948 on the Columbia River, causing immense damage and destruction in the lower Columbia River area, including my district and that of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack], in which over \$104,000,000 in loss of property was suffered together with a number of lives that were lost in the flood.

In Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 5472, these flood-control projects in the Columbia were estimated to cost \$22,295,000, covering bank protection and dikes. I call attention to some of the projects which should be constructed at the earliest possible date in order to avoid another catastrophe in the event of flood conditions in the Columbia River such as occurred in 1948.

You will recall that this flood in the Columbia River was one of the major disasters which devastated our country in 1948. The President asked the Corps of Army Engineers to make a special survey and examination of the area and report what protective works should be constructed to prevent a like disaster in the future and to provide so far as possible against flood hazards. The Army engineers made this examination and the projects included in Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress, for the Willamette River and the Columbia River area are recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers for emergency projects to prevent so far as possible in a short-range program the recurrence of such a disaster. These projects are so vital to protect against flood damage and are of

such emergency nature that it would be unfortunate if they were not authorized at this session of the Congress. As a matter of fact, I urged supplemental or deficiency appropriations be provided for them before the Eighty-first Congress adjourned so that they might be completed before another flood season arrives.

I call attention specifically to three projects which not only have been approved and included in Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress, but which, according to the information given me by the Army engineers, are essential in the national defense program. One of these is improvement in Multnomah Drainage District No. 1 to prevent flood damage.

Multnomah Drainage District No. 1: This district lies in Oregon along the left descending banks of the Columbia River at mile 112, northeast of Portland, and contains 8,417 acres protected by about 69,000 feet of levees. At the time the levees were constructed, the land was used for general farming, truck farming, and grazing. At present, the area has become primarily residential, except for the important Portland-Columbia Airport, which is within the district. One failure in the levee system, at the pump house, occurred during the 1948 flood. With the degree of development now existing in the area, seepage through the sand levees should be controlled to a greater degree than exists at present. This control requires the construction of a toe drainage system throughout the entire length of the levee, a system of interior drains leading to the pump house, and the installation of additional pumping capacity. Four cross levees will be constructed on existing roads, thus dividing the district into five areas to relieve the present situation in which a continuous area about 15 miles in length is vulnerable to damage from a break at any point in the levee. Total estimated construction cost including new cross levees is \$2,000,000, of which \$1,758,500 would be Federal costs and \$241,500 would be non-Federal.

The average annual flood damages in this district that can be prevented amount to \$146,400 and greatly exceed the average annual charges, both Federal and local, to build and maintain the project. A Federal flood control project for this district was authorized in the 1950 Flood Control Act. This act requires that local interests, in addition to agreeing, first, to hold and save the Federal Government free from damages; second, provide rights of ways and lands for the project; and third, maintain and operate it after completion, will also, fourth, make a cash contribution of \$180,000.

The defense importance of this project lies principally in the Portland International Airport, which is so vulnerable to flood. In 1948 this airport was completely submerged for several weeks, but has now been repaired and is actively used by commercial airlines, both national and international and as training bases by the Air Force and the Air National Guard. Important defense communications and warning installations are located in the district.

It is urgently requested that \$25,000 be provided to initiate planning on this important flood-control project.

Sandy drainage district: Another project is the Sandy drainage district, vitally essential not only for the prevention of enormous flood damage in the event of another disastrous flood such as occurred in 1948, but also to protect installations for the production of materials of vital interest in the war effort.

This district is located at river mile 118.5 in Multnomah County, Oreg., on the Columbia River between Sandy River on the east and Multnomah drainage district No. 1 on the west. The district contains 1,556 acres, and includes the Northwest's largest aluminum reduction plants and the Troutdale Airport. The area is protected by about 19,000 feet of levee, which successfully withstood the 1948 flood. Seepage, however, was considerable, and an active flood fight was necessary. In order to provide adequate interior drainage, a complete system of toe drains with ditches leading to the pump house is required, and additional pumping capacity is necessary. Total estimated construction cost of this work is \$368,000, of which \$291,000 would be Federal costs, and \$77,000 would be non-Federal.

Based on statistics accumulated by the Corps of Engineers, the average annual flood damages which can be prevented in this district exceed the average annual charges to provide protection and a Federal flood control project was authorized for this district in the 1950 Flood Control Act.

The defense aspects of this district are very important. The Troutdale Airport is a defense installation now actively used by the Air Force and the National Guard, and is used as an alternate landing field by commercial air lines when, as occurs often, the Portland International Airport is fog-bound. The aluminum reduction plant owned and operated by the Reynolds Metal Co. is producing tremendous quantities of vital defense materials. In the 1948 flood alone almost 14,000,000 pounds of aluminum production was lost. This loss represented about 10 percent of the annual output of the plant.

Funds for initiating the planning of this project in the amount of \$25,000 are urgently needed this fiscal year.

Johnson Creek, Willamette River Basin: Another project of vital concern for the protection against floods in this area is what is known as the Johnson Creek area. Johnson Creek, a tributary of the Willamette River, drains an area of approximately 54 square miles between Clackamas and Columbia Rivers. The flood plain is highly developed and quite populous. The town of Gresham is situated at river-mile 15 and the villages of Cotton, Linneman, and Jenne lie between Gresham and the mouth at Portland. Between river-mile 9.5 and the mouth, the stream passes through the environs of Southeast Portland and at a number of points lies within the city limits. The Cazadero line of the Portland Electric Railroad is built on the banks of the stream from Portland to Haley about 4.5 miles above Gresham.

Flooding by Johnson Creek, which occurs almost annually, results in heavy damage to the adjoining residential and business properties, interrupts transportation, damages bridges, floods septic tanks and cesspools, contaminates wells, and reduces value of real estate. Average annual flood damages amount to about \$132,300.

The plan of improvement for Johnson Creek, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950, provides flood protection in the Gresham area against floods with an expected frequency of once in 7 years. In the area between river miles 5.19 and 7.79, which includes the Southeast Portland Lumber Co. mill, protection is justified against floods with an expected frequency of once in 25 years. The remainder of the channel between the mouth and mile 10.27 is to be improved by clearing the channel in the various reaches to improve the channel capacity. The cost of these improvements is estimated at \$1,376,400, of which \$923,900 would be Federal and \$452,500 would be non-Federal. Average annual benefits expected from the improvements are estimated at more than \$200,000 and the improvements are justified by a ratio of benefits to costs of about 3 to 1.

This project area has considerable defense importance, for main-line transportation systems both parallel and cross the stream valley. These transportation lines are vital to defense, as they service the industrial heart of Portland and its thriving waterfront. An important sawmill producing vital defense timber products will also be protected in this project.

I strongly recommend that consideration be given to the provision of funds to initiate planning on this important project.

The flood plain of the lower Columbia River, from the vicinities of Washougal and Sandy Rivers just upstream from Portland to the mouth, embraces about 170,000 acres, of which approximately 70,000 acres are unprotected against overflow. The degree of protection varies and in numerous instances is inadequate. A considerable portion of these areas is highly developed industrial, urban, and agricultural land, protection of which is definitely feasible and economical. The experience during the recent 1948 flood has demonstrated conclusively that the raising, strengthening, and extending of certain existing flood-control works are essential to provide protection against major floods, and that certain new areas should be protected by levees and necessary appurtenances.

There are a number of other projects approved in Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress, for the protection of the lower Columbia River Basin, which I am not discussing before you today because I realize that under the program during this emergency and the national rearmament that it is not planned to take up any project that is not of an emergency nature or needed in the war effort. I do sincerely trust, however, that there will be included in this bill at least \$10,000,000 to start the planning of these emergency projects in order that construction work may get under way so that they may be completed at an early date, not only in the interest of national defense

but to prevent the immense damages that will ensue in the event of the recurrence of another flood in the proportions of the 1948 Columbia River flood.

Mr. Chairman, as is well known, the Columbia River area contains the greatest pool of potential hydroelectric power of any area in the United States; some 40 percent of our hydroelectric power is there and only 10 percent is developed. Notwithstanding we have a great dearth of hydroelectric power at the present time to carry on the national defense program, not only in the Hanford Atomic Energy Plant but in the aluminum, metallurgical, and forest products plants. Two projects on the Columbia River, Albeni Falls and the Dalles Dam, which are under construction have been eliminated from this bill and no appropriations therefor are made. I most sincerely hope that when this bill reaches the other body amendments will be made to include in it sufficient funds to carry on the flood-control projects I have enumerated and appropriations for the Albeni Falls and the Dalles Dam projects so that these essential works may go forward without further delay.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to bring to the attention of the Members a terrific flood problem which exists on the Missouri River in my district. For several years past the Army Engineers have not received the amount of funds they needed since 1947 when President Truman took it upon himself to freeze 50 percent of the funds which Congress had appropriated for flood control for fiscal year 1948. The money the Engineers have received since 1948 has been spent to a great degree to protect the construction work that had been previously done between Omaha, Nebr., and Kansas City, leaving the stretch from Sioux City to Council Bluffs with but very little construction work except to build a few levees to keep the river from breaking through and starting a new channel, which would eventually cost the taxpayers of America many, many million dollars more than the cost of the levees which they did build during the past several years.

This year the Army Engineers asked for \$5,000,000 for channel maintenance and bank erosion control from Sioux City to Kansas City. I appeared before the committee and asked that that be increased \$2,000,000 and that the \$2,000,000 be earmarked for construction from Sioux City to Council Bluffs, Iowa, for bank erosion control and channel maintenance. I am sorry to say that the committee did not see fit to allow that amount, but, to the contrary, the \$5,000,000 was reduced to \$4,250,000. Of course, for me to ask that more of the taxpayers' money be spent, I must step out of cast, but I am not apologizing for

doing so in this case because of the fact that flood control on our Federal streams is something the people cannot do for themselves. In fact they are forbidden to do so by law. I have never asked for appropriated funds for things for my people or anyone else which the people could do themselves. Our problem is simply this. Each spring when the floodwaters come down in torrents from that great area northwest of Sioux City, Iowa, it overtops the levees, breaks through, and floods thousands upon thousands of acres of the finest land that lies outdoors, made it unproductive, and which also means that in years to come it will be necessary to spend many, many millions of dollars more than would be necessary to do the job now, in addition to the great loss suffered each year by the farmers and people in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer an amendment for I know it would suffer the same fate as other amendments which have and will be offered, but I do want to apprise the Members again of this serious matter in the hope that a new day will soon arrive when we will look after the needs of deserving people here within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I shall read into the RECORD the statement I made when I appeared before the committee on February 20 in support of my request:

Mr. RABAUT. We will now hear from our colleague, Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. For the record, I am Congressman BEN F. JENSEN, representing the Seventh District of Iowa. You will remember that on May 9, last year, at that time I appeared before this committee in regard to the terrific damaging floods and the need for additional money above the budget. Appearing with me was E. C. Myrland, Iowa State senator; R. A. Rawlings, engineer of Monona County, Iowa; E. M. Prichard, attorney for the board of supervisors, Monona County, Iowa; W. F. Wright, Onawa, Iowa; A. L. Thomas, county engineer, Harrison County, Iowa; William H. Welch, counsel, board of supervisors, Harrison County, Iowa.

These gentlemen, along with me, were especially interested, as you will remember, in that section of the Missouri River from Sioux City to Council Bluffs. While I am of course interested in all of the river problems in my district, that section of the Missouri River is the one that we are most concerned about at this time.

Our testimony appears in part 2, from pages 356 to 546, inclusive, which was given last year by these people whom I have just named. If you will remember, the county engineers had maps here and pointed out the places where bank-erosion control was desperately needed. I have been informed by the Army engineers that they requested \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 1953 for channel maintenance and bank-erosion control from Sioux City to Kansas City. That figure was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to \$5,000,000 for bank-erosion control and channel maintenance from Sioux City to Kansas City. I am also informed by the Army engineers that because of that reduction it will be impossible for them to spend any or at least very little for this purpose north of Council Bluffs, Iowa, where the river is out of control today and is eroding the banks terrifically and will sooner or later break through. It could break through in several places, and thus start a new channel, and that new channel may take off across country and go through Missouri Valley, Iowa, a town of 5,000 people, 9 feet lower than the river is 12 miles away. That is what worries us most.

Every spring there are thousands upon thousands of acres of the best productive land in America inundated, and rendered completely useless for agricultural production. Yet irrespective of all the facts we have presented, only a fraction of the funds actually needed to the job which should be done are made available to this area. I have never, since I have been a Member of Congress, asked for a single dime to do things for my people or anyone else that they could do for themselves, and should do for themselves. But you know this is a problem which the people cannot solve; they are helpless. It is criminal to let this condition go on longer. Every year that it is let go is going to cost millions of dollars more than if we do what should be done now. It is quite certain that floods will again occur in this area. And all of those thousands upon thousands of acres of land will be flooded again, and it will wash out agricultural levees, and the farmers will again spend their own money to build them up again as best they can. The engineers help them some, but it is just one of these things which is penny wise and pound foolish to let go year after year when the flooded land could be protected if the needed work is done now.

Mr. RABAUT. The engineers made a request within the ceiling on your project for \$5,000,000, and above the ceiling for \$8,000,000, so the \$13,000,000 is not all within ceiling. The engineers should tell you.

Mr. JENSEN. They did.

Mr. RABAUT. If they wanted \$13,000,000 for that project they should have kept within the ceiling.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I understand.

I hope you gentlemen will appreciate the fact that the Army engineers have spent approximately \$35,000,000 for bank-erosion and channel-maintenance control from Sioux City to Kansas City over years since the Congress directed the Army engineers to make the Missouri River navigable from Sioux City to the mouth. Of that \$35,000,000 which has been expended, the Army engineers will testify to the fact that over half of the structures which have been installed with this \$35,000,000 have now been washed out and destroyed. They contend that it is better economy to attempt to save the structures below Omaha with the money they have received each year, than it is to attempt to do anything of any consequence above Omaha or Council Bluffs to Sioux City.

North of Omaha the structures which have been installed in the past years are almost completely destroyed and now for several years past the river is taking its natural course, which has destroyed land by the thousand of acres.

Mr. Thomas said last year at this hearing—Mr. Thomas is the engineer for Harrison County—quote: "You will note it has taken this and coming down here"—he was pointing to a map—"there is a very prominent citizen—and it cut this corner off and came in here. It took nearly 3 acres of land off one farm and it does it so fast that you cannot get the stuff out of the way. One man had 160 acres at this point with a full set of buildings and the only thing left today is a trace of that land and the only thing left for that old gentleman to do is go on the county relief."

"He is completely wiped out. All of the title to the land is gone. It is serious. That is just one of the conditions there," unquote.

Mr. RABAUT. We had an explanation of that yesterday.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Christenson and Mr. Krogh appeared before this committee.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. They were here yesterday.

Mr. JENSEN. They live in Woodbury County where Sioux City is located.

Mr. RABAUT. They had pictures of it. They showed how much acreage was taken out of

each plot. A fellow had 100 acres, now he has only 62.

Mr. JENSEN. The floodwaters are constantly eating away at the banks, Woodbury, Monona, and Harrison Counties. We are sitting on a keg of dynamite. It is not only destroying the land that is being eroded, but in the spring we know, as every year, thousands upon thousands of acres will be flooded again. Now if the Army engineers were given \$2,000,000 more to spend in fiscal year 1953 and that \$2,000,000 could be earmarked for bank-erosion control and channel maintenance from Sioux City to Council Bluffs and Omaha, right across the river from each other, then a job could be done in saving the farmers from being flooded and prevent that river from breaking through and starting a new channel next year as it has on many occasions in the past hundred years. I know it is difficult to go above the budget but my committee has done it on several occasions, where we could see we were justified to do so. We are spending money all over the world for things just like this and letting our own problems go by the board. Gentlemen, that kind of business simply does not make sense.

I just know that if this committee can see fit to add \$2,000,000 more to the \$5,000,000 which the budget has requested for this work from Sioux City to the mouth, to be used in fiscal 1953, that it would save many millions of dollars in years to come.

Then there is another matter which I must bring to your attention, and that is the Little Sioux project; the Little Sioux River empties into the Missouri River in Harrison County. There we have the situation that when the Missouri River is at flood height it backs up the waters of the Little Sioux River and floods a great productive valley. Last year at one time we had about 90,000 acres of land under water in the Little Sioux Valley; and there was not a dime in this budget, the 1952 fiscal year budget, for the Little Sioux Valley project. But the Army engineers were kind enough to allot around \$200,000 out of the emergency fund to assist those farmers to get the water off the land after the river went down, that it helped get water out of part of the valley.

You can understand, gentlemen, it is a terrible heartbreaker to see this destruction go on out there year after year in that fine valley and nothing, practically nothing, being done about it. I sit on the Subcommittee of the Interior and help appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars each year for irrigation and reclamation projects to put water on practically worthless land to make it productive and in my district there is almost no money spent to keep water off the finest land that lays outdoors, and let me say, gentlemen, I'm about fed up, and one of these fine days, God willing, fellows like myself may have more power in Congress than we now have. That is not a threat, that is a humble promise, my colleagues, for this committee and others to ponder over.

Mr. RABAUT. It is very good land.

Mr. JENSEN. It just does not make sense, but never have I penalized anybody because of that. Regardless of my feelings, I still know that we must have more land under cultivation or one of these fine days when the good Lord decides not to give us rain and sunshine in proportion to what he has in the last 9 years of bumper crops, if we have a couple of years of drought in this Nation with the land we have in production now, food prices will soar, people will then wonder why they complained about the cost of food in 1952.

Because of that, with the population increasing 2,000,000 or more a year, I know we have to have more land in production to feed our people in years to come. But when I see the best land that lays outdoors, wonderful, fertile, productive land, taken out of production each year because this Con-

gress, which appropriates billions for useless purposes, refuses to appropriate needed funds to protect such land as this, then certainly America is on the wrong track completely.

I plead with you gentlemen to help the people out there to save that valuable land.

We have a bridge situation. They built a bridge on dry land, you know. The Army engineers said, "Here is the channel, build the bridge here." The east end of the bridge is now about 2,000 feet from the east bank because of the bank erosion of the east bank at that point. There it sits and cannot be used until the channel is stabilized upstream, and put where it belongs.

Of course we hope that we can get that channel put back where it belongs. Then of course that bridge can be used. It is a very important highway. It is a Federal highway and certainly could be termed a military highway. In conclusion let me say again that all in all this is one of the things that should be done just as quickly as possible while we have an opportunity to spend a few million dollars which, if not spent very soon, will cost us possibly 10 to 1 in future years to come.

I plead with this committee to allow the funds which I have requested for this worthy cause.

Mr. RABAUT. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a very short sentence on this one: Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth. Our committee reduction was achieved by allowing the same amount as in 1952. Anybody that gets the same amount for 1953 that they got in 1952, with the war effort and the defense program and the tremendous expenditures going on in this country, is doing pretty well.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: Page 5, line 5, strike out "\$117,710,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$119,210,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be used for the Craney Island disposal area."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time than is necessary—

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia had already started debate on his amendment. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. RABAUT. All right.

Mr. HARDY. I think a point of order probably would not be well taken, anyway. I presume it would be on the ground that the appropriation is not authorized.

Mr. RABAUT. All right; I will take my chances on a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Anyway, since the point of order came too late, I should like to present this picture.

There is a project authorized for the Craney Island disposal area at a total cost of \$7,667,700. The reason I am offering this amendment at this time is because of what I consider to be an

urgency which I believe will result in a considerably increased expenditure. I believe we can save a considerable amount of money over a relatively short period of time by the adoption of this amendment.

I have before me a letter from the Chief of Engineers in connection with this project. He points out that it will take from 18 months to 2 years to complete the retaining levees and revetments for the authorized project. The project is a disposal area for the disposal of dredged material, without having to haul that material out to the ocean in barges or in the Engineers' dredge boat that is used to maintain the channel. That maintenance work has to go on every year. Up to the present time they have been dumping this dredged material in holes in the harbor. They have reached the point now where those holes are filling up and it has been determined that the present practice cannot be long continued. It is going to take us from 18 months to 2 years to build this facility to take care of this dredged material. We need \$1,500,000 to start it, and it will cost in the course of time approximately \$7,000,000.

General Chorpene says in his letter that the facility will save annually \$1,643,000 in transportation of the dredged material to the open sea, which will have to be done if this facility is not built.

I lay this proposal before you because I think it is of the utmost importance. The project has been approved. It is highly recommended by the Engineers. I understand it was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and I do not want anybody to be misled on that. Nevertheless, it is a worth-while project which the Congress has approved and the Engineers support. I hope it will be approved in the interest of economy. That is the only basis on which I offer it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, just a brief statement on this project. There is no planning for this; there is no budget estimate; it calls for the expenditure of \$1,500,000, and should be defeated.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no money in this bill for my congressional district, and not one penny in the bill for my State of Michigan. Nevertheless, I expect to support this appropriation bill.

What has happened on the floor this afternoon in general debate and now under the 5-minute rule is unmistakable evidence of what happens when 6 percent of the world's population, such as the United States represents, tries to

take on its back the other 94 percent. We are trying to scatter the funds and resources of this Nation all over this world, and at last the shoe is beginning to pinch. We are beginning to understand that we cannot do that unless we deny improvements to our own people. That is exactly what has happened on the floor today. If these projects, and the many surveys that are being asked for, were somewhere else in the world, they would perhaps receive favorable consideration. We are spending about \$500,000,000 in France to build dams and hydroelectric plants, and other public works and we cannot get any money to build the St. Lawrence seaway, which also has navigation and hydroelectric features involved in it. I suppose that is because it is not in the right location. Now, it may be a little bit discouraging to us to learn that on tomorrow, when we take up the State Department bill, we will find in it \$325,000,000 for point 4 program to rehabilitate, to improve, and to build works in the undeveloped areas of the world. Just as soon as the people of the United States begin to understand that as long as they vote for and approve a foreign policy which spends eight to ten billion dollars a year in other parts of the world, they must sacrifice here at home. If this is going to continue, then here at home we have to be denied money for surveys, projects, and other improvements, although vitally needed by the people of the United States. That is exactly what has happened here on the floor. Let the country know it. Let the press carry it that we cannot take the whole world on our lap and nurse it forever. I think the Committee on Appropriations for Civil Functions has done a very good job. You have worked hard. It is never popular to come on the floor and ask for more money than any committee sees fit in its wisdom to provide. That is what has occurred here today. I am sorry to see so many of our colleagues from so many States and sections of the country denied what undoubtedly is needed and needed badly. But the reason behind it is a foreign policy that asks for billions of dollars to be spent all over the world, but not for the benefit of our own people.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we tax our people here to get these billions of dollars to send away, and that prevents them from having a few hundred thousand dollars to improve their own rivers and harbors or anything else, including roads. May I go further and say that we are taxing our people to send 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 tons of coal a year for the last number of years to European countries of which at least 30 percent or 40 percent or 50 percent is an outright gift.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Do you suppose, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan, that

we could get more for our projects in America if we created a title similar to the point 4 program for America?

Mr. DONDERO. America seems to be the last country thought of.

Mr. KEARNS. We have reached a condition today where we need a program to help ourselves here.

Mr. DONDERO. There is no question about it, and unless we stop profligate spending, this country faces economic collapse.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how some members of this subcommittee reconcile their position in voting for these millions of dollars and still cutting out worthwhile projects in this country.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not trying to search the conscience of any Member of the House, but am simply stating the facts as they appear to be to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to comment on a paragraph appearing in the report. Funds in the amount of \$67,105,000 are contained in the bill for operation and maintenance. Then, in the report is this statement:

While the committee is cognizant of the fact that emergencies may arise calling for the unanticipated expenditure of funds on certain projects, it will expect the Corps of Engineers to more rigidly adhere to the tentative allocation of operation and maintenance funds presented in justification of these estimates than has been true in the past.

I presume that paragraph grew out of the discussion that took place on the floor at the last session when the appropriation was under discussion. I would like to ask the chairman just how far he expects this to go. He uses the term "While the committee is cognizant of the fact that emergencies may arise." If I understand it, before the United States Army Engineers would be justified in doing what they have heretofore done, that is, take money that was allocated for the maintenance of certain projects and shifting it to some other place, there must be some real justification and some real emergency existing.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not interpret that emergency to mean where the Chief of Engineers thinks it would be better spent. You mean where it would be an emergency created by a national defense situation?

Mr. RABAUT. Some situation that would arise that would justify it. I would say that the committee intends to keep an eagle eye on the Engineers about it. I am glad the gentleman brought it up and I am pleased to make that remark for the Record.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. I think that is a mild approach to it, but in recent years we have had to go before the Engineers and have a terrific fight to get even a part of the money expended on these maintenance projects that Congress appropriated for that pur-

pose. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I shall watch the operation of the Army Engineers with a great deal of interest in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the Committee briefly with regard to lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa. I appeared before the committee as a witness regarding that project. It was approved by authorization of Congress back in about 1930. This is one of two projects included in the President's budget for this year—new construction projects in rivers and harbors.

The project is in serious disrepair. It is a very tiny lock, 388 feet long. It was built in 1913, the first one built on the Mississippi River. This ancient lock is in danger of going out, and when it does you will find a serious freight blockage there. This is not just for my district. This is for the eastern part of Iowa, western Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota up to Minneapolis. There are about 11,000,000 tons of freight moving up and down the Mississippi in that upper region, of which about 4,100,000 tons pass through the Keokuk lock. I do not want to see that lock go out and bottle up all that freight traffic. We are dependent on it primarily for oil and coal going up the river and for grain going down the river.

I am speaking in a little broader interest than just that of my own congressional district.

Its importance was recognized by Congress back in 1930 when the new lock was authorized. It was in the President's budget this year, approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The hearings now before us show one particular project, which I will not name because I am not shooting at that particular project, where the total shipping included is only 340,000 tons and where the appropriation here included in this legislation is \$16,000,000 now to be appropriated and a \$50,000,000 total project cost. The Keokuk project is only an \$8,000,000 total cost and \$2,500,000 requested in this legislation for the next fiscal year. This sum would insure safe and uninterrupted annual freight movement for more than 4,000,000 tons.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this subject up because, aside from the gentleman's own State of Iowa, if that dam goes out, it completely wrecks all traffic up beyond Keokuk, Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. WIER. And the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and all that area up there will have no river traffic.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. It would take 2,000 freight cars and 30 locomotives to move the freight that moves through this Keokuk lock.

Mr. WIER. I will guarantee the gentleman 4 votes on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota very much. I testified before the appropriation subcommittee asking funds for the Keokuk lock. I must now serve notice on the committee that I intend to try to get this appropriation considered in the other body; and if I succeed I hope the conferees will not strike it out. As I say, I asked to be heard and they did give me a courteous hearing. This is probably one of the most serious freight bottlenecks in the entire Nation. Its importance is recognized by the Army Engineers and they recommend it for the appropriation.

I do not like to make comparisons with other projects, but there are included in this bill—and I shall not name them, because I am not shooting at them—projects which in my opinion stand no comparison in importance to this Keokuk project yet they are in the bill and Keokuk is not. The failure of this dam would be a very serious matter and disrupt all Mississippi traffic above this point. I cannot see why some projects were put in this bill that were not approved by the President, yet this project is stricken out.

I have been urging this project during the 13 years I have been in Congress; I am serious about this matter now. I shall try to have it put in the other body. This was done a couple of times only to be stricken out in conference. I am for economy; I think my record will stand up on the economy issue, but I do not want to see a calamity brought to the upper Mississippi by the failure of this lock.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Instead of its being Keokuk, Iowa, if it had been Keokuk, France, or Keokuk, Italy, the gentleman probably would have got his money.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree to that.

I shall not offer an amendment; I just want this committee to be prepared to have the item appear in the bill when it comes from the other body, and if it does I hope it will not be taken out in conference.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. How much will it cost? Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The estimated total cost is \$8,000,000. We are asking \$2,500,000 this year. There has been no expenditure on it up to date except for plans and specifications.

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

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has made a very fair presentation of the Keokuk, Iowa, lock situation. If you will look at the testimony in the committee hearings you will see that the Army Engineers made an excellent presentation of the dire need for this project. However, it is one of six projects that are new projects in the budget.

Our subcommittee felt that we could not approve any new project in the bill on the basis that to permit one breach in the dike would open the way to a flood.

This project is an urgent one, and I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that when we get in the committee on conference with the other body we will give it all possible consideration. If the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa is successful in getting the project in the bill in the other body, as I am sure he will be, there is an excellent chance that it will finally be in the bill in its final form.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I would like to know why it is we always leave it to the other body to do something for this body.

During each session of Congress we must depend on the other body to make grants to Arkansas and other States. It happens every time we get what we are entitled to have. We always have to get it from the other body. I would like to know why we leave everything up to the other body?

Mr. FORD. In this bill this year there is \$2,000,000 for the Arkansas River emergency bank stabilization, which I think is in the State of Arkansas in the gentleman's area.

Mr. TACKETT. What is in there for the Red River, the White River, the Ouachita River and for all the other rivers down there?

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman from Arkansas like to know how much money is in this bill for the State of Arkansas? The State of Arkansas has \$9,000,000 in this bill for river and harbor flood control. If the gentleman will look through some of the figures for other States he will find that some States received absolutely no funds for the flood problems that plague them.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, Arkansas is so located as to have greater needs. Every drop of water that goes down to Louisiana goes through Arkansas in order to get down there.

Mr. FORD. Well, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. TACKETT. It is a matter of proof.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman might be somewhat prejudiced in his opinion as to whether or not Arkansas needs more than anybody else. The State of Arkansas did not do too badly with \$9,000,000 while some of the other States did not get anything.

Mr. TACKETT. The State of Arkansas, the State of Louisiana, or any of those States in that area has not asked for one single solitary dime that was not fully recommended unanimously by the Engineers. If we just had what the Engineers have recommended there would not be any trouble. We get one drop out of every billion spent in this country.

Mr. FORD. The Army Engineers do recommend many projects which the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress do not approve of. I do not think the gentleman's argument is very effective.

Mr. TACKETT. That is also an opinion.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I fully appreciate the gentleman's remarks regarding the Keokuk situation. I know the gentleman's committee has been under a terrific strain; however, I shall look for-

ward to some action being taken on this matter shortly.

Mr. FORD. We will do our very best. Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the position which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has taken with regard to the Keokuk project. As you know, this has been recommended for a number of years by the Corps of Engineers and has been repeatedly turned down by the committee. Apparently the opinion is that this is something like the deacon's one-horse shay, it will go on forever.

The Army Engineers have testified that this particular lock and dam is in such bad state it might collapse at any time. If that were to happen traffic on the upper Mississippi River would be tied up for from 2 to 3 years.

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

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

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have had occasion to look into the situation to which he and the gentleman from Iowa both have referred. I hope that during this session some appropriation may be made to begin work on what I consider to be a very important project.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Tennessee because it is my opinion that there are at least three or four other projects presently being recommended in this bill which are much less meritorious than is the project at Keokuk. I hope that if the Senate sees fit to restore this item the House will take action to correct a mistake it is making in not having this project in the bill today.

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

Mr. Chairman, the work we are doing here in Congress reminds me of Don Quixote fighting windmills. About all we do is have recommendations come in from the administration, and they tell us what we can do and what we cannot do, and then we are circumscribed to that extent. It does not matter how much the Engineers recommend or how vital the projects are throughout the country, we are circumscribed by the dictates of the administration. Now, I do not know; I have not been here except over the last 2 years, and possibly the Republicans, when they are in power, will write a slate and tell you what you can do and nothing else; but, at least, since I have been here, we have been told what we can expect to get. The Engineers make a recommendation, it goes to the Bureau of the Budget, and they cut it out, and because they cut it out it is not put back in by a legislative budget.

I have had letters from home, and they told me not to place all the blame on President Truman; that the Congress appropriates the money; they have control of the purse strings and can do or not do the things that need money to have them brought to fruition.

I have a project of very great importance in my district. The people are not

asking for anything unreasonable; they are only asking for that which has been natural for the Federal administration to take care of, and that is the flood control and the planning and bank stabilization of rivers. They are ready and willing and anxious to put up their share of the money for a project that is very essential to the entire area. I think that we are going afield in doing a lot of things that private enterprise is ready and willing to do, and that is in the construction of power projects. We had the Engineers before us the other day, and they admitted that there was no flood control in the Grand Coulee project, that cost several hundred million dollars; there was no flood control in the Bonneville project, which cost several million dollars to construct, all of which could have been done by private enterprise. Now we are trying to fool the public by telling them that they are getting flood control, and they are not getting flood control in those two big projects. Without a doubt, a lot more of them are being built throughout this country which are strictly power projects, and they are charged up to flood control. I believe that we should have a right to come in here and amend the bill in order to take care of those types of projects for which the Government is responsible, namely, rivers and harbors and flood control. I believe that we are not doing our duty unless we do segregate these proposals and do what the Congress is supposed to do with taxpayers' money, and not build power projects up and down the entire extent of our country out of taxpayers' money, especially when they can be constructed through private enterprise.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

EXAMINATION, SURVEY, PLANNING, AND OTHER STUDY PROGRAMS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed flood-control projects; including preliminary examinations and surveys; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized flood-control projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; to remain available until expended, \$1,215,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys and plans and specifications shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak just briefly and propound an inquiry to the Chair. We all have a bunch of amendments here that we would like to offer, but I do not think many of us have any hopes of getting them adopted, and I think if we can get them in the RECORD it will probably serve the purpose. I think if we all had the opportunity of extending our remarks we probably could take care of the purpose for which we are sitting here today.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point and that debate on all amendments to the bill close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. TABER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will use up the rest of my time, if I may.

We spoke a minute ago about the projects that had not been approved by the budget. There is one project that was denied in this bill that was approved by the budget. I refer to the Cape Girardeau flood-control project. Not only was that project denied by the committee but they have approved in this bill \$4,951,000 for the completion of projects which will further contribute to worsening the floods at Cape Girardeau.

All of our trouble at Cape Girardeau has been brought about by projects that have been built by the Federal Government. As I said in general debate, for a hundred years we had only four floods, from 1927 back, and Cape Girardeau was established in 1801. However, from 1942 to 1951, after the building of other projects, we have had floods in 7 out of the 10 years, and with the completion of these projects for which they have authorized almost \$5,000,000 you will make conditions worse there. It appears we are going to have water standing 19 feet deep at the flood stage there. During those 7 years out of the 10 that we had the floods, we had 261 days that the railroad could not operate the main line between St. Louis and Memphis.

This is a project that has been approved by the budget and approved by the engineers, and it would be ready to go. We need some money for it. Out of fairness, I am going to offer an amendment as we progress on this bill to try to restore that amount to the bill. It will take \$1,000,000 to do it. However, in view of the fact they have already allowed \$5,000,000 to complete projects which will make our situation worse there, I think it should be adopted. So I will see what the House is going to do on that.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. They will tell you that the project is not approved by the budget and it must be approved by the budget. Then when it is approved by the budget they will tell you it is not important, that there is no use to put it in the bill. I was told that on two projects approved by the budget.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 6, line 7, strike out the colon and insert a comma and the following: "of which \$20,000 shall be available for a survey of the Minnesota River in Minnesota by the United

States engineers, from a point 3 miles above and 3 miles below the North Mankato-Mankato area."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it plain that I am not asking to increase the amount the committee has allowed for these preliminary surveys. I merely want to be sure that when we get done my people, before they are flooded again, will have an opportunity to get the survey. Therefore I want the sum earmarked.

What is the situation we are in?

Mr. Chairman, the committee has appropriated \$1,215,000 in this item. The Army engineers have brought in about 80 or 85 projects for which they ask \$1,600,000 for surveys. The situation is simply this. We cannot move until we get these surveys by the Army engineers. Just think of it. Here is an item of a little, miserable \$20,000, and those affected are in the situation where we call up the Army engineers and they say, "Congressman, we are sorry, we asked for \$1,600,000 and your \$20,000 is not in there." Now, that is certainly the finest sort of a tug of war that we are going to have. There are probably 40 to 50 Members of the Congress, and maybe even more than that, who are interested in various projects in their districts. Somebody is going to be disappointed. Some projects are just simply not going to get their survey, which is the basis for what is to be done or recommended in the matter of flood control. That is the situation in which every Member who has a project which comes under this bill will find himself. The tragic mistake, in my opinion, is that we should find ourselves in that kind of a position when people are risking their lives and their homes are being destroyed or threatened together with all of the other things that they have to worry about, on a little item of \$20,000.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps there will be other amendments offered. But I owe my people the duty of doing everything that I can for them. This is the second time that I have ever asked for a single dollar. You were very kind to me a couple of years ago and gave me a small appropriation for a small boat harbor in my State, which was frozen because the Korean war came on. So we did not get it. This will be the first appropriation. I hope to have it earmarked. I hope I will not have to argue with the engineers as to whether I am in or out of the shuffle. I want to be in, and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

It is just about a year since the cities of North Mankato and Mankato were flooded. Some 6,000 people had to be moved from their homes. Damages in excess of \$2,000,000 were sustained. In addition to all of the dislocation and damages, the Federal and State and local taxing units have lost thousands and thousands of dollars in tax revenues.

It is a tragic and unfortunate situation that in the allowance which has been made by the committee, the projects were not either specified or eliminated, instead of throwing in a number of projects which require \$1,600,000 to allow for the surveys as requested by the United

States engineers and that the projects were not allowed item by item and earmarked.

In my opinion it was the responsibility of the committee to decide the need, under the testimony before the committee, and make its decision one way or the other, rather than to leave it in the realm of gamble and uncertainty as to what projects the engineers must necessarily select for survey under this bill.

The result is an impossible situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and in order to close debate I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 3 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have been sitting here all day patiently, with work piling up in my office, waiting for an opportunity to offer an amendment to this amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. This, I am sure, is not the gentleman's amendment. I am sure the gentleman is not going to offer an amendment to this one, is he?

Mr. REED of New York. I am going to follow this.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman, of course, can offer any amendment he cares to following this.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee realizes the fact that I am here in a legislative position, and it just happens to be my duty in the Congress to oppose these amendments. I hope nobody in this entire body will take any of this in a personal manner. I have the highest respect, and in a most particular way, for the gentleman who just offered the pending amendment. He says some people are going to be disappointed. Why, everybody is going to be disappointed so far as survey money is concerned who does not have a project which is related to the national defense—everybody, and there are 435 of us here. So naturally the gentleman falls in that category with the rest of us. If his project is essential to the defense effort, then it can be included by the engineers, and if it is essential, I would be one who would be willing to help the gentleman. So there is no need of saying this is just a \$20,000 item, and is a small amount, because it is these small amounts that have given us the debt which we have today. While I am on my feet I want to say this, so we will not have it a half dozen more times today—about all this money that we are spending abroad. There is not one dime in this bill for any Marshall plan money. There is not one dime in this bill for anything like that, so quit bringing a foreign red herring here and sticking it into the nice clean American waterways.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 52, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 6, line 7, strike out the colon, insert a comma and the following: "Provided, That from said sum of \$1,215,000, of which \$25,000 shall be available for a survey of the Wellsville flood project in the Allegheny County, N. Y."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor so often in this case that I must confess it is becoming a little bit embarrassing. It becomes a little more so when I fail to get votes that I feel I ought to have for a project that has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, that has been recommended by the Army engineers as a defense plant, and a project which has been authorized.

Now, that has been the situation over a period of time. I want to impress the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who referred to these foreign projects and said he did not want to hear any more about it. I say to you, you told my constituents who were present at the hearing that this was a good project. They thought that you meant that at that time. Now, is it a bad project now or is it a good one?

Mr. RABAUT. Just a minute. If you want to put me on the spot I will put you right back on the spot. I am one member of a committee of five. I said it was a good project and I still say it is a good project.

Mr. REED of New York. That is fine. I thank you for that commitment.

Over a period of years I challenge any Member of the House, particularly on that side, to show the same amount of billions—I say billions of dollars that I have voted against in this House. I have voted against every foreign boondoggling bill that has been before this House since 1933. Every one of them. Now, this is a defense area, and the men cannot even get to their work in these defense plants, and many times during the war they could not even get there, because of devastating floods. We have had a flood in this village, Wellsville, N. Y., in 1942, in 1945, in 1946, in 1947, in 1948, and two in 1950. The last flood cost that fine American town over \$400,000 in damages. How much it has cost the defense plants, I do not know, because the people could not even go to work. Our soldiers are fighting abroad and they need the things that these defense plants are producing. I say it is time for us to begin to give some serious thought to this thing.

Here we are, thrown into the hands of the engineers, and they can take it or not, just as they like, but the engineers have seen this project, and they testified before your committee that it was a defense project. You commended it as a good project.

I hope that you people in this House, after the long years of service that I have put in here, will give some consideration to that fact and protect this town in my congressional district from these ruinous floods. I do not know how

many of you have witnessed one of these floods, water racing through the town, women so frightened that they gave birth in the boats which were carrying them; when their houses are gutted with floods and the schools are closed and the place is made subject to epidemics among the children. It seems to me we are penny wise and pound foolish here.

I still say that the billions spent abroad are all boondoggling. I have noticed on the Isle of Capri in the Bay of Naples where they built the Augustus Caesar Hotel, one of the finest hotels in the world with our taxpayers money. Do you think that is the way to stop communism? What must the workingman think when he looks up and sees what the Americans have built for the rich over there? That does not make sense. It creates resentment.

Let us be sensible today and give this amendment a favorable vote.

Let me say further that this is an earmarked proposition.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and wish to say only that the gentleman from New York asks that \$25,000 be earmarked for a survey of his project.

Mr. REED of New York. And approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RABAUT. For a survey for his project. This has come on us suddenly. The survey is complete, surely the gentleman does not want to spend the money twice. The engineers say that the project is ready for planning.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. I am just explaining to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, my statement before the Civil Functions Subcommittee follows:

STATEMENT OF DANIEL A. REED, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FORTY-FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK, RELATIVE TO THE WELLSVILLE, N. Y., FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to each member of this subcommittee, for this opportunity to present facts in support of an appropriation for an authorized flood project New York, which district I have the honor in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of to represent for the past 33 years.

The project relates to the village of Wellsville in Allegany County, N. Y., which village has a population of about 9,000 according to the recent census. In this flooded village area are important defense plants, as General Chorpene testified on page 491 of part 1 of the civil-functions hearings for 1953, as follows:

"Mr. RABAUT. How about Wellsville, N. Y.?"

"General CHORPENING. That is a local flood protection project for an area which has a number of manufacturing concerns such as the Sinclair Refining Co., Julius Kayser Co., and Bausch & Lomb Co. All these plants supplied equipment to the Armed Forces in World War II and are important at this time in connection with defense production."

There was heretofore duly authorized for the project \$609,000. The Budget Bureau recommended a planning item for this project last year amounting to \$34,500. I am delighted to know that the Budget Bureau has now recommended a planning item of \$25,000 for this project for 1953.

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., United States district engineer

at Buffalo, N. Y., at my request furnished these peak flood stages at Wellsville, N. Y., from July 1942 to November 1950 inclusive:

Date	Peak flood stage	Estimated damages ¹
	<i>Feet</i>	
July 1942.....	11.4	\$210,000
May 1945.....	10.2	30,000
May 1946.....	13.4	250,000
April 1947.....	9.4	20,000
March 1948.....	9.8	30,000
March 1950.....	12.1	60,000
November 1950.....	14.3	400,000

¹ Adjusted to 1950 price levels.

I may say in this connection that under date of December 27, 1950 I wrote to Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., district engineer, United States Engineers Office, 960 Elliott Square Building, Buffalo, N. Y., as follows:

"MY DEAR COLONEL SCHULL: I shall appreciate it if you will furnish me with a complete report on the extent of the damage to the residential and industrial districts of Wellsville, N. Y., caused by the flood of November 25 and 26, 1950. I need this information for legislative purposes. I would also like to know to what extent did this flood damage potential war industries in said area. In addition, will you please let me know the severity and damage of this flood as compared with the flood incurred in 1942, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 and March of 1950?"

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., replied as follows to my letter of December 27, 1950:

"DEAR MR. REED: Reference is made to your letter of December 27, in which you requested a report on the flood at Wellsville in November 1950 and a comparison between that flood and previous floods. The enclosed map shows the limits of the areas flooded in Wellsville in July 1942, May 1946, and November 1950. These three floods caused more damage than any others. In 1942 damage was confined principally to the Dyke Creek area.

"Plants of Sinclair Refining Co., Air Freighter Co., and Julius Kayser Co. are in the flood area. The Bausch & Lomb plant on Pearl Street west of the Genesee River is not directly damaged by floods, but employees cannot get to work because it is surrounded by floodwaters. The municipal water and light plant is in the flood area.

"When it is forced to shut down the above industries and the Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., outside the flood area, are affected by loss of electric service. The Bausch & Lomb plant has only recently started operation, but all the others produced military supplies during World War II and all are potential suppliers.

"Flooded areas along Broad, Miller, Hanover, Rauber, Cameron, Chamberlain, Stevens, and Brooklyn Streets are residential, and there are a few commercial establishments affected on South Main Street. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is damaged frequently. Except for Island Park and the baseball field on the opposite side of Dyke Creek, the remainder of the flood area is undeveloped.

"Flood damage begins at Wellsville when the river rises above 7.5 feet on the gage at the water and light plant. As a result of heavy rains, the river rose above this stage early in the afternoon of November 25, reached a peak about midnight, and then dropped below flood stage before noon on November 26. The peak was the highest on record.

"The water and light plant was shut down from November 25 to 29. Power service was interrupted for only 1 hour, after which it was supplied from another source. Water pumps were out of service for 24 hours. During that time, the supply in storage fell below a normal day's usage and would have been inadequate for fire fighting.

"Spot interviews were made after the flood and compared with damage at the same points in previous floods. On this basis, the damage at Wellsville from the November 1950 flood is estimated at \$400,000. Damages to industries because of lost production were low, since only the refinery normally operates on week ends.

"The following table lists the peak stages at the water and light plant and estimated damages in the floods listed in your letter:

Date	Peak flood stage	Estimated damages ¹
	<i>Feet</i>	
July 1942.....	11.4	\$210,000
May 1945.....	10.2	30,000
May 1946.....	13.4	250,000
April 1947.....	9.4	20,000
March 1948.....	9.8	30,000
March 1950.....	12.1	60,000
November 1950.....	14.3	400,000

¹ Adjusted to 1950 price levels.

"Local officials consider that clearing and snagging work done in Wellsville in 1950 reduced the peak stage of the November flood. They understand that the work was not of sufficient scope to eliminate damage in a major flood.

"Very truly yours,

"H. W. SCHULL, Jr.,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer."

The authorization for the Wellsville, N. Y., flood project did not become law in time to permit me to get the appropriation; moreover, it is seldom that an appropriation is made for an authorization the same year. To provide against damage to Wellsville from a flash or sudden flood pending a future appropriation, I sent under date of January 11, 1950, the following letter to Col. E. H. Forney, district engineer (at that time), Buffalo, N. Y.:

"DEAR COLONEL FORNEY: I have a flood-control project in my district, with reference to Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., which, of course, is part of Genesee River and its flood-control problem. The menace of recurring floods to the village of Wellsville is ever present and you may recall that I made application on November 3, 1948, to have Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., cleared under the authorization for emergency flood-control work.

"A request was submitted by Col. Herbert Vogel, then district engineer stationed at Buffalo, under date of November 18, 1948, for \$20,000 for clearing and snagging in Dyke Creek and Genesee River, but funds appropriated for the purpose in the fiscal year 1949 had been exhausted before that time, I was so informed.

"I had an authorization for this entire project at Wellsville inserted in a bill which passed the House during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, but it did not pass the Senate. The bill is now pending in the Senate and I doubt if it will become a law in time to enable me to procure the appropriation this year to carry out this work.

"In the meantime the people as well as the residential sections and schools and public buildings are in danger of spring floods and even flash floods at any time. Therefore, I feel that I will continue to be under very severe criticism on the part of the people of that village unless some effort is now made under the authorization for emergency flood-control work to relieve this village pending the time when the authorization for this project becomes law and the appropriation procured.

"I want to say here and now that I appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from the Corps of Engineers and I do not intend to ask for anything that I do not think has real merit. I believe that if there is any place where this emergency fund could be made available, at the earliest practicable

moment to convince the people that the Government is going to relieve them of this frequent damage of property by floods as well as the danger to the life and health of the community, I think it is this particular community—Wellsville, N. Y.

"I have a letter dated January 25, 1949, from Col. Herbert Vogel, the then district engineer at Buffalo, from which I quote: 'After the next appropriation act has been passed, if you believe the urgency of the work is critical, this office will consider resubmission of the request.'

"I wish to state now that I firmly believe that the flood-control work to be performed at Wellsville, N. Y., is critical and in need of relief under the emergency act pending the time when the authorization becomes law and the appropriation has been made.

"Yours sincerely,

"DANIEL A. REED."

Without going into further detail the following telegram is sufficient to show the fine cooperation I received from the Army engineers:

"Re your telegram September 27, 1950, clearing and snagging operation on Genesee River and Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., completed on September 22, 1950, included removing snags, debris, and shoals, widening channel where required, widening at bends and clearing under all bridges on Genesee River within limits of Wellsville, N. Y., and approximately one-half mile down stream and on Dyke Creek within limits of Wellsville, N. Y.

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS."

I wish to stress that the industries in Wellsville, endangered by frequent and devastating floods, are industries engaged in national defense. This fact, it will be recalled, is mentioned in Colonel Schull's letter to me under date of January 4, 1951. It has now been brought to the attention of the Civil Functions Subcommittee as set forth on page 491 of the hearings by General Chorpining.

Under date of March 9, 1951, I received from Robert L. Fleischer, Esq., village attorney at Wellsville, the following letter together with a copy of an enclosure, both of which I inserted in the hearings in 1951, as they bear on national defense:

MARCH 9, 1951.

HON. DANIEL A. REED,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I thank you for your recent communication and telegram in connection with our flood-control program. I am enclosing, for your information, copy of letter which I am today sending to the Army engineers. Thanking you for your help in this matter and hoping you will continue actively to support our flood-control program, I am

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT L. FLEISCHER,
Village Attorney.

MARCH 9, 1951.

C. H. CHORPINING,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Office of the Chief of Engineers,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CHORPINING: Senator Ives has forwarded to me copy of your letter to him of February 23, 1951, in connection with the proposed Wellsville flood-control project. Your office has previously been sent my memorandum of December 20, 1950, which attempted to set forth in some detail the urgent need for flood control in the light of the defense and war production of this community.

I am today in receipt of further information from the Air Preheater Corp. which is supplemental to the information contained in the memorandum referred to. This cor-

poration is now very deep in defense program and an interruption of its production would be very serious. It has unfilled orders totaling 2-years' production. These are for Ljungstrom preheaters, of which it is the only manufacturer in the United States, and they are for installation in steam plants furnishing power for public utilities, atomic-energy projects, navy yards, ordnance plants, synthetic-rubber plants, and refineries producing high-octane gasoline.

The Power Equipment Division of the National Production Authority has assigned Defense Order No. 35 to apply to its equipment. It addition, it is continuing its research for the Navy Department with regenerative as applied to gas turbines.

In order to meet its deliveries, it is erecting additional building facilities and purchasing new equipment at a cost presently in excess of \$241,000.

Will you kindly take these additional factors into consideration in connection with your efforts to speedily hasten the authorized program at Wellsville, the need for which you have indicated your recognition.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT L. FLEISCHER,
Village Attorney.

I repeat that the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for planning this flood-control project for 1953 is \$25,000.

I feel that inasmuch as this is an area of national defense industries it is entirely inadequate, but the planning item will initiate this flood-control project.

As I have said the authorization is \$609,000. If the threat of an all-out world war III is as serious as we are told and as vast appropriations indicate, it is of the utmost importance that we preserve our essential defense industries from flood damage as well as from enemy destruction.

When on June 12, 1951, the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H. R. 4386 making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, I offered an amendment to insert the planning item of \$34,500 recommended by the budget for the Wellsville project. It was defeated, although the vote was the largest given for any item in the bill H. R. 4386.

I respectfully urge that your committee approve of the item of \$25,000 as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1953.

MR. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment. I am opposed to the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: Page 6, line 7, strike out "\$1,215,000," and insert "\$1,615,000, \$400,000 of which is to be expended for the New England new job survey."

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the full time to which I am entitled. Eight hundred thousand dollars was requested for the New England survey under this heading.

The total request for all flood-control surveys was \$6,465,000. The actual amount given in the bill is only \$1,215,000. The total in the bill, therefore, for rivers and harbors and flood-control surveys is only \$1,700,000. Since the total request for the New England survey alone for rivers and harbors and

flood control amounted to \$1,100,000, and the total is only \$1,700,000 for surveys all over the country, it is obvious that very little of this money will be allotted for our New England survey.

I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan exactly why his subcommittee has refused to allow this money for the New England surveys when he knows how important it is to us, when he knows it has been planned from 1950, when he knows it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and when he knows it will not come into fruition until 1954.

Mr. RABAUT. Because there is already \$14,000,000 authorized and we are just trying to hold it down a little.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman tell me why you allow in this bill \$80,000,000 for Oregon, around \$37,000,000 for California, and yet you reduce so drastically the money for the New England States. Five out of the six New England States will receive no money in this bill for any project.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Massachusetts, since he has been on this floor today, has been strictly parochial in his arguments and viewpoint. I have not a dime in this bill for my district or for my State except some maintenance of some small harbors, so there is nothing in it for me. But all the gentleman has talked about since he has been here is New England.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. RABAUT. No; I do not object to it, but this is not a parochial bill; this is a bill for the benefit of the United States of America.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point I want to make now is that New England is a part of the United States of America, and five out of the six New England States do not receive a penny of money from this nearly a half-a-billion-dollar bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I have explained it to the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY. I hope the gentleman does not object to our attempting to protect the interests of New England; and they are not protected in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. I wish to join my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in offering this amendment to the bill. I personally think that it is asking little or nothing for the northeast section of the country. After all, when I look at this flood-control appropriation of \$221,000,000-plus, I see only one item going to the Northeast States, and that is the one located in Connecticut of which a paltry sum of \$540,000 is appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to be sectional as far as this appropriation bill is concerned. I have not come here and my colleague has not come here at this time asking for this particular appropriation. This was asked for and approved by the Assistant Chief of Engineers of Public Works when he testified before the committee. On page 504 he testified as follows:

Funds in the amount of \$800,000 are required for continuation of the survey of the resources of the New England-New York region. This investigation was authorized by

the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, the President's directive to the Secretary, Department of the Army, dated October 9, 1950, and resolution adopted by the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee on October 27, 1950.

Membership consists of one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Army, Commerce, Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Security Agency, with the Department of the Army the chairman agency.

The survey is being conducted in cooperation with the governors of the seven States participating in the survey. Scheduled completion date for the survey report is June 30, 1954.

In the fiscal year 1951, \$366,600 was expended by the Corps of Engineers; for fiscal year 1952, the amount of \$400,000 was appropriated. This was only one-half of the amount needed to carry forward the investigation on schedule, and in order to meet the scheduled date of completion it will now be necessary to operate at a considerably accelerated rate over that for fiscal year 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHENOWETH: On page 6, line 7, strike out the sum "\$1,215,000" and insert the sum of "\$1,600,000."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment relates to the appropriation for the examination and survey program for flood control.

My amendment adds the sum of \$385,000 to the \$1,215,000 which the committee has included for survey and investigation work, making a total of \$1,600,000 for this program.

The argument has been advanced by the committee this afternoon on several occasions that certain items were not in the budget and therefore could not be included in this bill. This item was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, in the amount I propose. The Army engineers have also requested the sum of \$1,600,000 for this survey program.

If you will refer to page 499 of the hearings you will find a list of about 90 projects in some 35 States which are still under investigation by the Army engineers.

There is only one of these projects in my State of Colorado, calling for the total expenditure of \$20,000. I mention this to refute any argument that we are seeking something for Colorado to the exclusion of any other State. There are some 35 States included, so this appropriation is a matter of general interest and concern.

You will recall my colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], a distinguished member of this subcommittee, when I inquired as to why this amount was reduced from \$1,600,000, as requested, to \$1,215,000, as contained in the bill. I believe he stated it was because we did not have the money. I do not think our people are going to accept an answer like that, be satisfied with such an explanation.

All I am seeking to do by my amendment is to carry out the expressed will of the Bureau of the Budget and the

request of the Army engineers. I know you are going to hear it said that we already have many projects which are authorized and have not yet been completed. But I think this subcommittee should be realistic in its approach to this problem. Congress has authorized and directed the Army engineers to study and recommend flood-control projects. By its attitude this committee is, to a large extent, nullifying the will of Congress and substituting its own program.

I might remind the House that last year this committee refused to appropriate one single dollar for this examination and survey program. The sum of \$3,000,000 was inserted in the other body, and this entire amount was stricken in conference. It is obvious that the committee is not in accord with the intent of Congress in authorizing these investigations.

As I stated, there is only one project for Colorado in this program. That is the Purgatoire River project in Trinidad. This project is now pending in the office of the district engineer in Albuquerque. The investigation work is more than 60 percent completed. The report on this project would now be in Washington except for the fact that Congress failed to provide any funds of survey work during this fiscal year. This project is of great importance to the people of Trinidad. The Army engineers have been working on the flood-control problem at Trinidad for many years. It now appears that a feasible project will be worked out.

Along with other Members of this House, some of whom have expressed their attitude this afternoon, I want to be sure that sufficient funds are made available to the Army engineers to complete the investigation work on the projects they have submitted to the committee. There are about 90 such projects located in every section of the country.

After Congress directs the Army engineers to investigate a proposed project we should give them the funds with which to finish their work, so that a report may be submitted to Congress through regular channels.

There are some 471 flood control investigations which this Congress has authorized and which have not been completed. The Army engineers are not asking for funds to investigate all of these, but have selected some 90 of these projects. I am not sure that all of these will be investigated, but I want to make sure that sufficient funds are made available for this number. There are many small projects in here and the amounts requested run as low as \$2,500, \$3,000 and \$5,000. These are small projects as compared to others, but are very important to the people in their respective districts. Let us make certain that no one will be disappointed. I am asking you to support this amendment which will add the sum of \$385,000 and provide the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Army engineers so that this work may be completed during the next fiscal year. Not all of the reports on these surveys will be favorable. We are not adding one single dollar to the amount that is to be expended for construction work. We do not know and

the Army engineers do not know in advance which of these projects will be feasible and which will be rejected. However, after Congress takes the first step and directs the Army engineers to make an investigation of a flood-control project we have an obligation to the local community involved. The local agencies spend time and money in assisting the Army engineers in these investigations. We should not build their hopes up and then let them down. They have the right to expect fair treatment from Congress. I submit we should give the Army engineers the sum of \$1,600,000 so that they can continue the investigation and survey work on these 90 projects and complete their reports as soon as possible.

Let us decide whether we want to continue the civil functions of the Army engineers. In my opinion they have done a good job in years past, and I believe it is the overwhelming sentiment of this body that they continue. If this is true, we should not handicap them with this unnecessary restriction of funds for their survey program. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes, but inasmuch as my name was mentioned in the colloquy which I had with the gentleman from Colorado with respect to this item, I simply want to say this that because these funds in the amount of \$1,600,000 were included in the budget should be the basis for this House going along with the full amount and then referring to the fact that we said we would not add any not in the budget, certainly does not add up to the argument that he made because the budget included this, we ought to allow it in the full amount. The subcommittee never made any commitment of that kind. In fact, a reading of the bill will show to one who even makes a cursory examination, that we do not follow the policy of granting all the money that the Bureau of the Budget happens to recommend. I think it is worthy of note to repeat again that we have about \$8,000,000,000 worth of these projects hanging around loose. They have been surveyed and they have been examined and they are now awaiting appropriations to begin them. Now to say that this is not adding a single dollar for construction this year is correct, but it does not tell the story, because this will then be the forerunner of billions of dollars in subsequent years once these projects are started through the surveys and examinations that are contemplated now. I think we need to keep this program—and it is a worth while program of rivers and harbors and flood-control projects—somewhere within balance, and it needs to be kept compact enough so that the Congress and the Corps of Engineers can give it the surveillance it needs to have if it is not going to get completely out of line and in order that it is kept within reasonable bounds and that this Congress has a right to state, especially in this bill, that the committee's recommendation is

sufficient to do the job that this Congress ought to expect to have done.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to be absolutely fair with the gentleman. The only reason I brought in the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget is that the committee looks on the Bureau of the Budget as being more or less an authority and on their recommendations as being sacred. I do not look on the recommendations of the Budget Bureau in that light myself. We are the legislative body. I think we are the ones to determine what appropriations shall be made, and no other agency should dictate to us or tell us what we have to do. The defense has been made by the gentleman and other members of the subcommittee that a certain item was not in the budget. This is something the budget does recommend, and the Army engineers, too.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the action of this subcommittee in trimming the request of the Bureau of the Budget by 29 percent, or \$200,000,000, belies his statement that we think the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget are sacred.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But what I am trying to point out to the gentleman is this: They ask for a certain amount for 90 investigations, to complete 90 surveys. The gentleman's committee does not designate which ones shall be completed and which ones shall be ignored. How are the Army engineers going to determine that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They will have to determine that on the same basis they used in submitting this list to the Committee on Appropriations in the first place. They will have to be judged and given a priority on the basis of the need and the emergency of those particular projects.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You have already had this afternoon two very important Members of this body seeking to make sure that their projects would be taken care of, and I suspect there are many others on the floor this afternoon in the same situation. My amendment would take care of the whole group. Then the Army engineers would not have any excuse that the funds are not available.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be given the same consideration as the other amendments that sought to make increases in this amount.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REBAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARDY, 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. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

APRIL 1, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of the interference of other official business I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1952.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday, April 9, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The special order granted to Mr. JAVITS for tomorrow was vacated, and Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday, April 8, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

HOURLY OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce that the first order of business will be the remainder of the debate and consideration of the rule on the judges bill, and then the continuation of the pending appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House agreed to suspend

the rules and passed a bill authorizing \$90,000,000 for building offices and residences for the State Department all over the world. The Members of the House were completely hoodwinked by the semantics of the proponents of this controversial piece of legislation. The Members were told that it would cost the taxpayers of this country no money; the Members were told that the payments would come out of funds which this country might easily lose if we did not convert the funds into real estate abroad; the Members were told that we would save money on rent if we authorized the State Department to spend this \$90,000,000. All three of these statements are unfounded, on either study or fact.

Why, then, was not the House told the real facts of the case or at least why was not the other side of the controversy presented to the House for consideration so that the Members had an opportunity to make up their own minds after debate? The answer lies in the dangerous procedure followed of voting to suspend the rules. Under this procedure all time is controlled by those favoring the legislation. No time is available to those who are opposed to the legislation. As the gentleman from California, Congressman PHILLIPS, said yesterday: "I have so little time. I have only 2 minutes to oppose the bill, whereas the people who are for it had about 30 minutes." The only time I was able to get was through proponents of the bill yielding to me for questions, which I might add remained either unanswered or erroneously answered.

I certainly hope that in the future the House will see fit that if a matter is brought under a request to suspend the rules that the time be equally divided among those who are for the bill and those who might be against the bill.

However, I would like to point out a few things about this \$90,000,000 expenditure that the House voted yesterday which includes, I might remind my colleagues, authorization to spend \$600,000 for a single residence in Egypt, \$500,000 for a single residence in Greece, \$350,000 in Mexico, \$200,000 in Austria, in Germany, in Iraq, and Palestine, \$250,000 in Chile and Korea. Are we spreading American democracy by building palaces for the representatives of this democracy in these countries.

First, the committee that studied this bill did not print its hearings. At least I could not obtain copies. According to one of the members of the full committee, only two witnesses were heard on this bill. This in itself shows on its face lack of adequate consideration for the expenditure of \$90,000,000. Thirty million dollars more, I might remind my colleagues, than the entire annual cost of the legislative branch of Government.

Second, funds of the United States, whether frozen abroad or not, are still assets of the United States. These assets are subject to negotiation toward unfreezing; in other words, they are subject to recapture if we so desired. These assets can be spent in a hundred different ways in the countries con-

cerned, even under the present terms of their freezing. Spending them for State Department buildings and residences is by no means the only way they could be utilized. It is interesting to note the following colloquy from yesterday's brief debate, where the opponents of this highly-controversial matter were able to get in a few remarks edgewise, page 3205:

Mr. LANTAFF, of Florida. Was any thought given to the utilization of these foreign credits to assist countries receiving military aid under the mutual-assistance program, help them balance their budgets, thereby relieving the American taxpayer, and enabling us to cut down on the foreign-aid program about \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. CHATHAM (chairman of the subcommittee). That did not come before our committee.

Mr. LANTAFF. Why is it that instead of taking these credits to build residences and other fine buildings, we could not use them in the mutual-assistance program and save \$90,000,000 for the American taxpayer?

Mr. CHATHAM. I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Page 3207:

Mr. JENSEN. What I think the members would like to know is this: Could this money be spent for anything in those countries that this Congress approves?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is not in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. No; but can it be? That is the question.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am not qualified to answer that. I did not handle the setting up of the credits and have not made a detailed study of the agreements. But that is not in the bill, and I am confining my remarks to the bill.

The answer, I regret to say, is that nobody studied this question.

Third, you will note by examining table 1 of the committee report in the last column entitled "Balance available for other agencies," after appropriating funds under the bill there are 24 items which show minus funds available totaling a total of \$12,668,857 minus balance. In other words, twelve million seven hundred thousand of the \$90,000,000 in the bill does not come from idle balances. It must come from somewhere else. Where else is it to come from? There is a footnote hidden away which tells us:

Insufficient foreign credits are currently available to complete FBO program plans. It is anticipated that adequate credits will be acquired through subsequent agreements, transfers from other countries and/or purchase of necessary materials and equipment in other countries where credits are available.

Now note this. Credits from subsequent agreements—in other words, more funds of the United States are going to be frozen so that United States taxpayer cannot receive relief from them. Note also that when the State Department wants to transfer these so-called "frozen" funds around, they can do it with great facility. So, if they wanted to capture these unused funds for the United States taxpayer, they could do so.

Fourth, we are told we would lose these funds if we did not spend them. This is not true or, if it is true, then there is no need for \$7,900,000,000 additional foreign aid moneys to be voted

to be spent abroad. In other words, the \$90,000,000 could be spent for every single item listed in the foreign-aid budget if the State Department wanted it to be so spent. If we vote any sum for foreign aid in this Congress, to that extent we are in effect spending new taxpayers' money for the palaces contemplated to be built in this bill.

Fifth, the members are told we will save on rent by building \$90,000,000 worth of new buildings. Since spending roughly \$130,000,000 already we have saved \$5,000,000 in rent, incidentally, a saving of less than a million a year. At this rate, it will take us 130 years to get back our investment of \$130,000,000 even if we were to accept these foolish figures. Having had occasion to check some of the Governmental agencies cost accounting, I think it can be assumed that costs of maintenance, repair and janitor service, and so forth, have not been calculated in this \$5,000,000 saving, let alone amortization of the buildings.

Finally, I wish to point out that I have the honor to serve on the Subcommittee of Executive Expenditures on International Relations. We have before us a bill long recommended by the Hoover Commission and long needed as a law to create a commission similar to the Hoover Commission to study our overseas administration solely from the standpoint of organization and efficiency. If you could merely skim through the hearings we have already held and the reports we have considered you would shudder at the waste and inefficiencies that exist.

Yet we calmly want to go ahead and build palaces in which to house all personnel serving abroad as the result of such inefficient operation.

I want to close by saying again, we have experienced the danger of passing legislation through the procedure of suspending the rules. Whether you agree or not with the arguments that I have hereto advanced, I am certain that very few will fail to agree, that these matters I have raised should have been studied and debated. They were not studied and debated and the result is the House, in these times when we are supposed to be economizing, has voted \$90,000,000 of assets of the United States to build palaces abroad. I hope the Senate will go into this matter thoroughly so we will not have to go back into our districts to explain why there is no money for flood control, for example, but plenty for building castles in Spain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GREEN in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and include a statement by Asher B. Wilson, of Twin Falls, Idaho.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include a newspaper article and an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include two editorials.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

Mr. KENNEDY in two instances and to include a speech and a statement.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial appearing on March 25 of this year in the Louisville Times.

Mr. RANKIN to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include a list of pamphlets issued by UNESCO.

Mr. MEADER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York and to include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York to include as part of the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today his statement made by him on the same subject before the Civil Functions Committee.

Mr. BENDER in three instances.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. RABAUT in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2748. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 690. An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S. 1184. An act to extend the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia;

S. 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 1669. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to payments for the benefit of persons under legal disability;

S. 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives;

S. 2266. An act to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the periods of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948;

S. 2408. An act to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts;

S. 2549. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders;

S. 2677. An act to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind sent through the mails; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MURDOCK (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 5 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1952, 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:

1304. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "support of United States prisoners" for the fiscal year 1952 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1305. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1944 (Public Law 410, title V, sec. 511); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1306. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To authorize the Postmaster General to contract for motor vehicles for use on motor vehicle routes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. COLMER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the waiving of points of order on H. R. 7289. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1675). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1650. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2552. An act to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4021. A bill to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes" approved September 5, 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6769. A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section; without amendment (Rept. No. 1680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE 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. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 696. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7337. A bill to facilitate wine production, to modify present requirements with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7338. A bill to facilitate wine production, to modify present requirements with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7339. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, so as to provide that domestic corporations may be required by subpoena to produce the records of their foreign affiliates and subsidiaries, to require that foreign corporations doing business in the United States register with the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7340. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 7341. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1951, Public Law 233, Eighty-second

Congress, to provide a method of computing annual and sick leave for regular and substitute employees in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7342. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, so as to provide that incentive pay in the construction industry shall not be stabilized at less than that paid by the individual employer or earned by the individual employee in such industry during the period beginning May 24, 1950, and ending June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River development, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7344. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the third national jamboree for the Boy Scouts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 7345. A bill to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 7346. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of the police and fire departments and teachers in the Panama Canal Zone on the same basis as in the case of persons holding corresponding positions in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7347. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for non-pulmonary forms of active tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreement to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY (by request):

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to give the Secretary of Commerce the authority to extend further certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; 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. AYRES:

H. R. 7348. A bill for the relief of Epifano Trupiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7349. A bill for the relief of Anastasio Zawradinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 7350. A bill for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 7351. A bill for the relief of Marie Lim Tsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7352. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Kobiakov, Gottliebe Bohumila Kobiakov, his

wife, and Michail and Iwan, minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7353. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7354. A bill for the relief of Frederick Hendrik Potgieter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7355. A bill for the relief of Yoshikazu Tomashiro and Yoko Tomashiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 7356. A bill for the relief of the University of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7357. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Harold K. Butson; to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

663. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the City Council of the City of Clawson, Oakland County, Mich., in support of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

664. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of residents of Circleville, Orange County, N. Y., advocating the limiting to one the use of members of the same family in combat operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1952

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, by whose kindly providence we are sharers of the rich and dearly bought benefits which are ours in this land of freedom: We pray for Thy continued blessing upon our Republic. Make her, we pray Thee, more and more a nation which deserves Thy blessing. We thank Thee for the wisdom and the vision of the founding fathers; for national leaders who by the will of the people exercise power for them and not over them; for the fidelity of common people in obscure places; and for the patriotic heroism of our sons now defending our liberties on far fields of conflict as they front the powers of slavery and darkness.

Strengthen our determination to stem the tide of an aggression without pity or conscience. Make us worthy of our great heritage. In these decisive days for the whole world, give us a new sense of national destiny, deliver us from all pride and arrogance, and inspire the citizens of our free land to make this Nation, under Thee, as great in spirit as she is mighty in power. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 1, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 993) for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2157) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to private property arising from activities of the Army, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Sarah A. Davies;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols;

H. R. 1114. An act for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Kaiko Sugimoto (Kay Fair) and her minor children;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child;

H. R. 2221. An act for the relief of Gertrude Manhal;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eurasisa Binotto, Maria Balatore, and Giovanna Buziol;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of the Kio-man Instrument Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Bell;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida;

H. R. 3378. An act for the relief of Natale Joseph John Ratti;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Ying Chee Jung;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath;

H. R. 4037. An act for the relief of M. Neil Andrews;