The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion to lay on the table. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the precise nature of the motion before this body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is it that the Senator from California is moving to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is moving to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MAYBANK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If, without objection, the Senator insists——

Mr. MAYBANK. No; just give the Senator from South Carolina the nub of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not printed as yet.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina thanks the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May the Senator from Illinois make a request? Will the clerk be permitted to read the amendment which it has been moved to lay on the table?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah asks for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL] the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Ervin	Purtell
Barrett	Ferguson	Reynolds
Beall	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bush	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Upton
Carlson	Kuchel	Watkins
Cordon	Lennon	Welker
Crippa	Martin	Wiley
Daniel	Millikin	Williams
Dirksen	Payne	
Dworshak	Potter	

NAYS—34

Anderson	Humphrey	Mansfield
Burke	Jackson	Maybank
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Douglas	Kennedy	Murray
Frear	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	Pastore
Gore	Langer	Sparkman
Green	Lehman	Stennis
Hayden	Long	Symington
Hennings	Magnuson	
Hill	Malone	

NOT VOTING—19

Bricker	Flanders	McClellan
Byrd	George	Mundt
Case	Gillette	Robertson
Chavez	Ives	Russell
Duff	Kefauver	Young
Eastland	McCarran	
Ellender	McCarthy	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

(At 12 o'clock midnight, July 26, the Senate was still in session. The proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954:

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.
H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey.
J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas.
C. D. Jackson, of New York.
Charles H. Mahoney, of Michigan.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954:

Wright F. Morrow, of Texas.
Roger W. Straus, of New York.
James J. Wadsworth, of New York.
Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.
Ade M. Johnson, of Washington.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Paul Emmert Miller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954, vice R. M. Evans, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Henry Grube, Mobile Gospel Tabernacle, Mobile, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come today in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We dare not come in any other name. We plead no merit of our own, but we do ask that Thou wilt bless this session. We pray for our country. We pray for the President. We pray for all those who are in authority. We pray especially for those who are here this day. We pray that everything that is said and done may be done for the honor and glory of Christ our Lord.

In Jesus name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 23, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 10, 1954:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, Philadelphia, Pa., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On July 12, 1954:

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes.

On July 14, 1954:

H. R. 1948. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fung Hwa Liu Lee;

H. R. 2404. An act for the relief of Tibor Horanyi;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Annie Litke;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Dr. James K-Thong Yu;

H. R. 3191. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California;

H. R. 3903. An act for the relief of Sister Iolanda Sita, Sister Guerrina Brioli, Sister Pasqualina Coppari, Sister Anna Urbinati, Sister Ida Raschi, and Sister Elvira P. Mencarelli;

H. R. 4510. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Kon;

H. R. 4747. An act for the relief of Gio Batta Podesta;

H. R. 5265. An act for the relief of Margarete Hohmann Springer;

H. R. 5620. An act to remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado;

H. R. 5684. An act for the relief of Walter Kuznicki;

H. R. 5820. An act for the relief of Michael K. Kaprielyan;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 5842. An act for the relief of Viktor R. Kandlin;

H. R. 6478. An act for the relief of Nick Joseph Beni, Jr.;

H. R. 6636. An act for the relief of Gregory Harry Bezenar;

H. R. 6893. An act to credit the Shoshone Irrigation District with a share of the net revenues from the Shoshone powerplant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7146. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John McMeel No. 1;

H. R. 7371. An act to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates;

H. R. 7913. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 9232. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1955, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation;

H. R. 9340. An act to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use;

H. J. Res. 537. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 545. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade-Sample Fair, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On July 15, 1954:

H. R. 222. An act to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on certain calcined bauxite and to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillon of the Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 2406. An act for the relief of Andor Gellert;

H. R. 2683. An act to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629);

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Just Mayer;

H. R. 6412. An act to preserve the eligibility of certain veterans to dental outpatient care and dental appliances;

H. R. 8538. An act to provide for the revocation or denial of merchant marine documents to persons involved in certain narcotics violations; and

H. R. 9008. An act to provide for the deposit of savings of enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

On July 16, 1954:

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zygmunt Sowinski;

H. R. 1115. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suhula Adata;

H. R. 1762. An act for the relief of Sugako Nakai;

H. R. 2899. An act for the relief of Igor Shwabe;

H. R. 3333. An act for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Peter M. Leaming;

H. R. 4496. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain lands to the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, Upper Marlboro, Md., so as to permit the construction of public educational facilities urgently required as a result of increased defense and other essential Federal activities in the District of Columbia and its environs;

H. R. 6650. An act for the relief of Joseph Cerny;

H. R. 6998. An act for the relief of Erna White;

H. R. 9561. An act to correct typographical errors in Public Law 368, 83d Congress; and

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the completion of the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir on Sulphur River, about 9 miles southwest from Texarkana, Tex., as Lake Texarkana.

On July 19, 1954:

H. R. 733. An act for the relief of Hildegard H. Nelson;

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Mihai Handrabura;

H. R. 5355. An act for the relief of Eva Gyori;

H. R. 6422. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Government's grantors certain lands erroneously conveyed by them to the United States;

H. R. 7132. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7158. An act authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to S. J. Carver;

H. R. 7500. An act for the relief of Kurt Forsell;

H. R. 7802. An act for the relief of Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner;

H. R. 8692. An act to permit the payment of certain trust accounts to the beneficiary on the death of the trustee by savings and loan, and similar associations in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8973. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 8974. An act to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

H. R. 9143. An act to repeal the provisions of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act which prohibits a Federal Reserve bank from paying out notes of another Federal Reserve bank.

On July 20, 1954:

H. R. 5158. An act for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the estates of Opal Perkins, and Kenneth Ross, deceased; and

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Kuniyoshi Dillon.

On July 22, 1954:

H. R. 2617. An act for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon;

H. R. 6342. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; and for other purposes;

H. R. 7125. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; and

H. R. 7468. An act to amend certain provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize regulation, for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of certain motor-carrier transportation between points in foreign countries, insofar as such transportation takes place within the United States.

On July 23, 1954:

H. R. 8247. An act to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1954:

H. R. 1673: An act for the relief of James I. Smith;

H. R. 6263. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Alaska to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska;

H. R. 6642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen;

H. R. 6975. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Siskiyou Joint Union High School District, Siskiyou County, Calif.;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Nicole Goldman;

H. R. 8713. An act to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C., sec. 161 (d)), and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701);

H. R. 9005. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177); and

H. R. 9006. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate 28 paintings to the Australian War Memorial.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the conference report on H. R. 8300.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 293):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now recess.

CITATIONS FOR CONTEMPT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House he did, on Friday, July 23, 1954, make certifications to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the United States attorney, southern district of California, the United States attorney, eastern district of Michigan, the United States attorney for the district of Oregon, and the United States attorney, western district of Washington, as follows:

To the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

House Resolution 666, the refusal of Lloyd Barenblatt to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 673, the refusal of Mrs. Millie Markison to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 681, concerning the action of Francis X. T. Crowley in purging

himself of contempt of the House of Representatives.

To the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA:

House Resolution 667, the refusal of Richard E. Adams to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN:

House Resolution 664, the refusal of Bolza Baxter to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities and the willful and deliberate refusal to produce certain books and records of the Labor Youth League of Michigan before the said Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 665, the refusal of Horace Chandler Davis to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 674, the refusal of Benjamin F. Kocel to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 675, the refusal of Paul Ross Baker to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 676, the refusal of Curtis Davis to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 677, the refusal of Evelyn Gladstone to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 678, the refusal of Marvin Engel to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 679, the refusal of Martin Trachtenberg to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON:

House Resolution 669, the refusal of Thomas G. Moore to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 670, the refusal of John Rogers MacKenzie to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 671, the refusal of Donald M. Wollam to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 672, the refusal of Herbert Simpson to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON:

House Resolution 668, the refusal of George Tony Starkovich to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities and the disruptive conduct of the said George Tony Starkovich before the said Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 680, the refusal of Carl Harvey Jackins to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House today and tomorrow for 20 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand I have 10 minutes in which to address the House today, following the legislative business of the day. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman is in error. The gentlewoman has 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the Speaker.

AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the engrossed copy be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. 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. 116]

Angell	Hébert	Richards
Berry	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Bolton, Frances P.	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks, La.	Long	Secrest
Buckley	Lovre	Shafer
Chatham	Lucas	Short
Cotton	McCarthy	Springer
Curtis, Nebr.	Mailliard	Sutton
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Nelson	Thompson, Tex.
Fino	Osmers	Tuck
Fisher	Patman	Vinson
Harris	Perkins	Weichel
Harrison, Wyo.	Poage	Wheeler
	Powell	Willis
	Regan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will read the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD moves to recommit the bill H. R. 9757 to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 222, answered "present" 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—165

Abernethy	Fogarty	Mollohan
Addonizio	Forand	Morgan
Albert	Forrester	Moss
Andrews	Fountain	Moulder
Ashmore	Frazier	Multer
Aspinall	Friedel	Murray
Bailey	Garmatz	Natcher
Barden	Gary	O'Brien, Ill
Barrett	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Battle	Granahan	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Grant	O'Konski
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Neill
Bentsen	Gregory	Passman
Blatnik	Gross	Pfost
Boggs	Hagen, Calif.	Philbin
Boland	Hagen, Minn.	Pilcher
Bolling	Haley	Polk
Bonner	Hardy	Preston
Bowler	Hart	Price
Brooks, Tex.	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Herlong	Rabaut
Buchanan	Holifield	Rains
Burdick	Holtzman	Rayburn
Burleson	Howell	Reams
Byrd	Ikard	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Roberts
Cannon	Javits	Rodino
Carlyle	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Selden
Chudoff	Kee	Shelley
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Condon	Kelly, N. Y.	Shuford
Cooley	Keogh	Sieminski
Cooper	King, Calif.	Sikes
Crosser	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Landrum	Staggers
Deane	Lane	Steed
Delaney	Lanham	Sullivan
Dies	Lantaff	Teague
Dingell	Lesinski	Thomas
Dodd	McCormack	Thornberry
Dollinger	McMillan	Trimble
Donohue	Machrowicz	Watts
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Ill.	Whitten
Doyle	Madden	Wickersham
Eberharter	Magnuson	Williams, Miss.
Edmondson	Mahon	Williams, N. J.
Elliott	Marshall	Winstead
Engle	Matthews	Withrow
Evins	Metcalf	Yates
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Yorty
Fine	Miller, Kans.	Zablocki

NAYS—222

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Fernandez
Adair	Campbell	Ford
Alexander	Canfield	Frelinghuysen
Allen, Calif.	Carrigg	Fulton
Allen, Ill.	Cederberg	Gamble
Andersen, H. Carl	Chenoweth	Gathings
Andresen, August H.	Chiperfield	Gavin
Arends	Church	Gentry
Auchincloss	Clardy	George
Ayres	Clevenger	Golden
Baker	Cole, Mo.	Goodwin
Bates	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Beamer	Coon	Gubser
Becker	Corbett	Gwinn
Belcher	Coudert	Hale
Bender	Cretella	Halleck
Bentley	Crumpacker	Hand
Betts	Cunningham	Harden
Bishop	Curtis, Mass.	Harrison, Nebr.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Va.
Bonin	Dague	Harvey
Bosch	Davis, Wis.	Hays, Ark.
Bow	Dawson, Utah	Heselton
Boykin	Dempsey	Hess
Bramblett	Derounian	Hiestand
Bray	Devereux	Hill
Brown, Ohio	D'Ewart	Hillelson
Brownson	Dollive	Hillings
Broyhill	Dondero	Hinshaw
Budge	Donovan	Hoeven
Busbey	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.
Bush	Durham	Hoffman, Mich.
	Ellsworth	Holmes
	Fallon	Holt
	Fenton	Hope

Horan	Miller, N. Y.	Shafer
Hosmer	Mills	Sheehan
Hruska	Morano	Simpson, Ill.
Hunter	Mumma	Simpson, Pa.
Hyde	Neal	Small
Jackson	Nicholson	Smith, Kans.
James	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Jenkins	Norrell	Smith, Wis.
Jensen	Oakman	Springer
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Stauffer
Jonas, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.	Stringfellow
Jonas, N. C.	Ostertag	Taber
Jones, N. C.	Patterson	Talle
Judd	Pelly	Taylor
Kean	Phillips	Thompson, Mich.
Kearney	Pillion	Tollefson
Kearns	Poff	Utt
Keating	Prouty	Van Pelt
Kilday	Radwan	Van Zandt
King, Pa.	Ray	Velde
Knox	Reece, Tenn.	Vorys
Krueger	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
Laird	Reed, N. Y.	Wainwright
Latham	Rees, Kans.	Walter
LeCompte	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wampler
Lipscomb	Riehlman	Warburton
Lyle	Riley	Westland
McConnell	Rivers	Wharton
McCulloch	Robeson, Va.	Widnall
McDonough	Robsion, Ky.	Wigglesworth
McGregor	Rogers, Fla.	Williams, N. Y.
McIntire	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Calif.
McVey	Sadlak	Wilson, Ind.
Mack, Wash.	St. George	Wilson, Tex.
Martin, Iowa	Saylor	Wolcott
Mason	Schenck	Wolverton
Meader	Scherer	Young
Merrill	Scott	Younger
Merrow	Scrivner	
Miller, Md.	Scudder	
Miller, Nebr.	Seely-Brown	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Klein Patten

NOT VOTING—44

Angell	Hébert	Regan
Berry	Kersten, Wis.	Richards
Bolton, Frances P.	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks, La.	Long	Secrest
Buckley	Lovre	Short
Chatham	Lucas	Sutton
Cotton	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Nebr.	Mailliard	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Tuck
Dowdy	Nelson	Vinson
Fino	Osmers	Weichel
Fisher	Patman	Wheeler
Harris	Perkins	Wier
Harrison, Wyo.	Poage	Willis
	Powell	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Cotton against.

Mr. Perkins for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Patten against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Long for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Lovre for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska against.

Mr. Wier for, with Mr. Fino against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Regan.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231 nays 154, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—231

Abbitt	Gavin	Nicholson
Adair	Gentry	Norblad
Alexander	George	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Oakman
Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	O'Hara, Minn.
	Gubser	Ostertag
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn	Passman
	Hale	Patterson
Arends	Haley	Pelly
Auchincloss	Halleck	Phillips
Ayres	Hand	Pillion
Baker	Harden	Poff
Bates	Hardy	Prouty
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Becker	Harrison, Va.	Ray
Belcher	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
Bentley	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Betts	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Bishop	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Hiestand	Riehlman
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hill	Riley
	Hillelson	Rivers
Bonin	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Bosch	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Bow	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Sadlak
Bray	Holmes	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Saylor
Brownson	Hope	Schenck
Broyhill	Horan	Scherer
Budge	Hosmer	Scott
Busbey	Hruska	Scrivner
Bush	Hunter	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Hyde	Shafer
Campbell	Jackson	Sheehan
Canfield	James	Sikes
Carrigg	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Cederberg	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calif.	Small
Chiperfield	Jonas, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Church	Jonas, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Clardy	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Judd	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Kean	Stauffer
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Stringfellow
Coon	Kearns	Taber
Corbett	Keating	Talle
Coudert	Kilday	Taylor
Cretella	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Crumpacker	Knox	
Cunningham	Krueger	Tollefson
Curtis, Mass.	Laird	Trimble
Curtis, Mo.	Lantaff	Utt
Dague	Latham	Van Pelt
Davis, Wis.	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Dawson, Utah	Lipscomb	Velde
Dempsey	McConnell	Vorys
Derounian	McCulloch	Vursell
Devereux	McDonough	Wainwright
D'Ewart	McGregor	Walter
Dodd	McIntire	Wampler
Dolliver	McVey	Warburton
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Watts
Donovan	Martin, Iowa	Westland
Dorn, N. Y.	Mason	Wharton
Durham	Matthews	Widnall
Ellsworth	Meader	Wigglesworth
Fallon	Merrill	Williams, N. Y.
Fenton	Merrow	Wilson, Calif.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Fulton	Mills	Young
Gamble	Morano	Younger
Gary	Mumma	
Gathings	Neal	

NAYS—154

Abernethy	Fine	Morgan
Addonizio	Fogarty	Moss
Albert	Forand	Moulder
Andrews	Forrester	Multer
Ashmore	Fountain	Murray
Aspinall	Frazier	Natcher
Bailey	Friedel	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Garmatz	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Battle	Granahan	O'Konski
Bennett, Fla.	Grant	O'Neill
Bennett, Mich.	Green	Pfost
Bentsen	Gregory	Philbin
Blatnik	Gross	Pilcher
Boland	Hagen, Calif.	Polk
Bolling	Hagen, Minn.	Preston
Bonner	Hart	Price
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Brooks, Tex.	Holifield	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Holtzman	Rains
Buchanan	Howell	Reams
Burdick	Ikard	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Jarman	Roberts
Byrd	Javits	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Karsten, Mo.	Selden
Celler	Kee	Shelley
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Shuford
Colmer	Keogh	Sieminski
Condon	King, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	Kirwan	Spence
Cooper	Kluczynski	Staggers
Crosser	Landrum	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Lane	Sullivan
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Teague
Deane	Lesinski	Thomas
Delaney	Lyle	Thornberry
Dies	McCormack	Whitten
Dingell	McMillan	Wickersham
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Williams, Miss.
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Williams, N. J.
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Wilson, Tex.
Doyle	Magnuson	Winstead
Eberharter	Mahon	Withrow
Edmondson	Marshall	Yates
Elliott	Metcalf	Yorty
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki
Evins	Miller, Kans.	
Feighan	Mollohan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Klein Patten

NOT VOTING—45

Angell	Kersten, Wis.	Richards
Berry	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Bolton, Frances P.	Long	Scudder
	Lovre	Secrest
Brooks, La.	Lucas	Short
Buckley	McCarthy	Sutton
Chatham	Mailliard	Thompson, La.
Cotton	Morrison	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Nebr.	Nelson	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	Osmers	Vinson
Dowdy	Patman	Weichel
Fino	Perkins	Wheeler
Fisher	Poage	Wier
Harris	Powell	Willis
Harrison, Wyo.	Rayburn	
Hébert	Regan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Harris for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Rayburn against.

Mr. Tuck for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Sutton against.

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Cotton for, with Mr. Wier against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Lovre against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Berry against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Long.

Mr. Scudder with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Fino with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS. If he were here he would have voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills ever to be presented to this House. At present no one could possibly envision the ramifications of atomic energy and its future effect upon our economy and national life in war and peace.

There are great uncertainties and problems connected with this subject and some very definite certainties. For example, we know how terrible and destructive atomic energy harnessed for war is and can be. We do not know whether even more terrible and more destructive substances will be discovered to take the place of atomic energy but in view of scientific progress that is quite possible, indeed very likely.

On the other hand atomic energy may be able to provide most valuable peacetime uses in medicine, in science, in power, and other fields. At present its uses are limited. In the future they may well be extensive and fabulous beyond monetary measurement. But there is no certainty that they will be. There is as yet no assurance that atomic energy can competitively produce electric power. Such is the vagueness of the field in which we now propose to legislate. Only extended time can reveal the facts concerning this vital newly discovered force.

I am a believer in our system of free enterprise. I do not believe that the Government should conduct any business that can be efficiently conducted by private business. I do not believe that the Government should ever compete with private business so long as private business is capable of doing an honest, adequate job. In industries affected with a public interest, there are times when because private business does not or cannot do the job that the Government is compelled to intervene. Huge public power dams are an example of this situation.

But even in these instances the products and byproducts of such great public projects should be made available, insofar as practicable and possible, to the public through the medium of private industry.

Under this bill many patent rights may be granted to a certain few industries. In this way, a monopoly would be conferred upon a few by the terms of the bill over atomic energy and its secrets. Such monopoly rights may be relatively worthless, or they may be valued in the billions. There is a tight security curtain over this atomic field and I am unable to get the facts.

But I am not willing to vote to create a monopoly in this field, to give a few corporations exclusive rights to what may turn out to be extremely valuable assets of truly untold wealth.

I have other fundamental objections to this bill. I am not satisfied with its international pooling provisions. We are living in a very dangerous world—a world which is ablaze with the fires of Communist conspiracy and revolt. No one can tell when further serious aggression will come or where it will strike. Our so-called allies have not lived up to their undertakings under either the United Nations or NATO and I do not say this in an uncharitable sense. They permitted us to fight the Korean war practically alone and virtually unassisted. They have failed to implement their agreements under NATO. They have more recently at Geneva departed from our view of vital Indochina and Asian questions and deliberately gave aid and comfort to the Russian position.

We have no assurance whatever of what their future policy will be. It may move them, for trade or other reasons, closer and closer to the Soviet viewpoint. It may support the doctrine of peaceful coexistence in a world literally seething with rebellion and insurrection against the existing order willfully fomented and directed by the Soviet.

In view of this situation, I do not believe that we should share further atomic secrets or any other secrets until we definitely know just where we stand, just what our allies propose and just how they intend to carry out their solemn commitments to us and the free world.

We talk about getting some affirmative expression and act of good faith from the Soviet and I believe we should demand such assurance even though I have little faith that it will be forthcoming. But above all we should secure definite assurances from our own so-called allies concerning their future course, their policy, before we give them additional secret atomic information and techniques. I do not believe this feature should be adopted without very carefully devised safeguards.

Although I cannot support this measure, I am constrained to pay sincere tribute to the great American who has so ably handled the bill on the floor, our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. As one Member remarked, he conducted the debate and secured passage of the bill without ever raising his voice. That is a great tribute to STUBBY COLE. And it is an example which might well find emulation.

I believe the entire subject matter covered by this bill should be exhaustively and intensively considered by the Congress.

The bill could well reshape the entire economy and life of the Nation. It should not be enacted without further deep and most careful study.

I therefore hope the measure will be recommitted and revised to remove present unsound provisions and include proper safeguards. Thus we may be assured that the future military, economic, scientific, and humanitarian requirements of the Nation may be met, as well as we can meet them at this time when science is moving so swiftly and foreign affairs are so perilous and uncertain.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WAINWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders previously entered.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders previously entered.

THE BIG LIE TECHNIQUE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, according to the press, the Republican candidate for Governor of Iowa stated recently that "the Eisenhower administration had to ferret out in Washington more than 2,500 Government workers who had been disloyal to America."

As anyone who has followed the subject knows, the statement of the Republican candidate is false.

It is true that some 24 or 25 hundred persons have been tagged as "security risks" for various reasons including such things as alcoholism or conviction of a misdemeanor. No one would argue that persons with such faults should be kept in Government service—but that is no excuse for unfounded accusations of disloyalty against them. To my knowledge, not one of these persons has been convicted of an act of disloyalty; on the contrary, in all but a small fraction of these cases, their loyalty is not even questioned. Most of these persons were not even removed from their jobs under the methods set up by the President's security order, but left the Government under normal civil service procedures. Many of them had no knowledge that they were later labeled "security risk."

If the Republican candidate for Governor of Iowa made an honest mistake, I hope he will be man enough to follow the example of President Eisenhower's counsel, Bernard Shanley, who apologized publicly after making a similar misstatement.

If his false accusation was deliberate, I am confident that his attempt to deceive the people of Iowa will be unsuccessful.

REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all of us were saddened by the passing of our beloved colleague, Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. While his death was not unexpected, it came as quite a shock.

He has been seriously ill for some time, but with his strong sense of devotion to duty he insisted upon attending the sessions of the House many, many times when he should have been in the hospital.

SIDNEY CAMP was born in Coweta County, Ga., 62 years ago today. He was educated in the public schools of Newnan and Coweta County and received the bachelor of laws degree at the University of Georgia. He began the practice of law in Newnan in 1915.

SIDNEY CAMP has had a distinguished record of public service. He served in the United States Army 2 years, from 1917 to 1919, being a member of the American Expeditionary Force's 82d Division. He served as Representative in the General Assembly of Georgia from 1923 to 1928 and was Chairman of the Georgia House Judiciary Committee for 4 years. He was Assistant United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia from 1934 until August 1, 1939, when he was elected to Congress where he has served with honor and distinction ever since.

In the House, SIDNEY CAMP worked untiringly for strengthening the unemployment-insurance program, the social-security program, balancing the Federal budget, better farm and price support programs, and veterans' benefits.

He was conscientious in all that he did and he never dodged an issue. He carefully studied all proposed legislation and voted his true convictions.

SIDNEY CAMP was a brilliant man and probably had as much knowledge on all subjects as any man in Congress. He was quite a historian and never forgot anything he ever read or heard.

His magnetic and charming personality and his love of people endeared him to all who knew him. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word. To know him was to love him.

SIDNEY CAMP was keenly interested in the welfare of his fellow man. He never lost an opportunity to do a favor or to lend a helping hand.

He was an able lawyer, a fair and effective prosecuting attorney, an energetic, conscientious, and valuable Member of Congress, and true statesman. We shall sorely miss him in this body.

I wish that all of you could have attended the fitting and appropriate funeral service of our departed colleague on Sunday afternoon, July 25, 1954, in the city of Newnan, Ga. A vast throng of friends from the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia and from the whole State were present to pay last respects and tribute to their lamented friend and devoted public servant. Their presence attested the high regard and esteem in which he was held. The Georgia delegation, including Senator RUSSELL, and other Members of the House also attended the funeral service.

SIDNEY CAMP was one of the closest and dearest friends I ever had. I have suffered a keen personal loss in his passing. We had adjoining offices and we visited each other almost daily.

During all the months of his suffering I never heard him utter one word of complaint.

SIDNEY CAMP was a devoted husband and father. To Mrs. Camp and their fine son and daughter, Albert Sidney Camp, Jr., and Molly Farmer Camp, I extend deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to my personal and deeply valued friend, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP.

Yesterday, amid the rolling Georgia hills he loved so well, a group of us representing this House laid to rest our beloved colleague, SID CAMP, whom God in His infinite wisdom had removed from among us during the early hours of Saturday morning.

Many of you, I am sure, feel, as I do, a deep sense of personal loss in the passing of this fine friend and noble patriot, who sacrificed his life for his country, in line of duty, as surely as does any soldier amid shot and shell on a battlefield.

SID CAMP's death leaves a gap in the ranks of this House that will not easily nor soon be filled. His place in the House will soon be taken, but it will not be filled for many a long day, because SID CAMP was possessed of virtues so rare as to occur but infrequently in the passing of the years.

First of all, SID CAMP was a true friend. He understood friendship. He gave to friendship a depth of feeling that can only be truly understood by those of us who were fortunate enough to share his rare gift. His kindliness and generosity were especially treasured by the new Members, to whom he made available the fruits of his long experience and the gifts of his splendid mind.

Burdened as he was by the duties of the great committee on which he served and the requirements of his constituents and the host of friends who called upon him unceasingly, he yet took time to counsel with new Members to make their way easier and their service in this body more effective and valuable.

As one who came to rely on SID CAMP's sage counsel and wise advice during my service here, who has been fortunate to know the warmth of his great heart and the matchless fiber of his rugged integrity, I stand before you a sadder and poorer man because of the absence of his guiding presence.

But his loss to this body transcends keen pangs of heartache that any one of us may feel at his passing. The deep logic of his profound and penetrating intellect has impressed us time and again as he stood in the well of this House to analyze the complex legislation that his committee reported. Times without number he has plumbed the depths of the measures being considered to clarify obscure points and provide us with enlightened understanding of the most complex revenue measures that came before us for consideration.

But it is sadly futile for me to try to evaluate SID CAMP's contribution to our country with a few poor words. His work on this floor and in his committee has impressed his devotion in countless statutes of the laws of the land he loved. And his shining intellect, his bright spirit, and great heart have engraved themselves forever in the hearts of all who knew and loved him during his splendid years of service.

Today as we meet in saddened assembly and mourn our loss, I think it is not amiss to voice a prayer that on this day, and every day, the spirit of SID CAMP, from a brighter, fairer land, in a higher, nobler sphere, may descend to inspire and guide us in the deliberations of this House he served and loved so well.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe SIDNEY CAMP was the sweetest spirited and one of the humblest men that I ever knew. I never shall forget the help that he was so happy to extend to me when I first came to the Congress. That was his record with every man who came here from the State of Georgia, and all of the new men from other States as well who depended upon him for committee assignments and those he helped to get committee assignments. While he was a gentle and sweep-spirited man, he was tough-minded, and courageous. He was always glad to stand for what he thought was right.

Along with his other good qualities, SIDNEY CAMP had a sense of humor that was a great asset to him. While he was serious minded and took his job in the same manner, he did not take himself too seriously, which is the essence of a sense of humor. He was a raconteur and could tell wholesome and humorous yarns by the hour. He had an infectious and contagious laugh which made his stories still more appealing to his listeners.

It was this sense of humor and his wholesome outlook on life that enabled him to bear the physical infirmity which was his through the last few years of his life. He was cheerful and uncomplaining through it all.

His going is a distinct personal loss to me and to all who knew him as I did. He

had a brilliant mind, a splendid educational background, and a power of analysis that enabled him to go to the very heart of any problem he was considering. These qualities made him of great usefulness in his service on the Ways and Means Committee, which will miss him I know.

To his wife and family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy as I think today of SIDNEY CAMP and the years in which I have served with him in this body. I think he was closer to me than to many Members of this House. I was born and reared in the Fourth District of Georgia which he represented for 16 years. I first had a close and intimate acquaintance with him as we served together in the Georgia House of Representatives in the years 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928. I have watched his career with deep interest, as he went from there to a position in the United States District Attorney's office and then as he came to serve in this body, where he served so many years with distinction and ability.

Yesterday the book was closed on the life activities of SIDNEY CAMP. It was my sad experience to stand at the graveside as he was laid in his eternal resting place. But while his activities in person have been concluded, his life has not, in the deep sense of the word. He still lives in the hearts of the thousands of friends who knew him there and the many friends he made here during his period of service. I am sad indeed as I join with my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to his widow, children, brothers, and other members of his family.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, as is human, I peculiarly feel the great loss I personally suffered in the passing of my genuine friend. I am conscious, however, that this loss is shared by a grateful Nation. In the passing of ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, our friend and colleague, affectionately known to us as Sid, the Nation has lost one of its greatest sons. As an ambassador for the section from which he came and for the Nation that he completely loved, there has never been a greater, for every Member of this splendid body loved Sid and every person who ever knew him regarded him with affection. These facts indelibly mark a man as great and I am convinced there has never been a Member of Congress who had more friends from North, South, East, and West than did our friend, SID CAMP.

Mr. Speaker, during the illness and misfortunes Sid suffered it was amazing how all the Members were interested in Sid and deliberately sought every possible opportunity to be of service to him. For the last 2 years Sid was blind so far as eyesight was concerned, but, Mr. Speaker, that was the only blindness that could come upon Sid. There was a light in his heart, mind, and soul that illness could not touch, and that light had always been in Sid. I can hear him now when some of his numerous friends would say, "How are you, Sid?" He would reply, "My friend, I never felt better and saw less in my life." There was blindness on the outside, but the light burned brightly from within. Never have I seen a man who bore his afflictions with more grace. Never have I seen a man more appreciative of his friends.

Mr. Speaker, Sid was one of the most brilliant of men. Sid loved his country with unsurpassed love and loved this country's history and knew that history as few men ever knew it. Sid loved to discuss our history and gloried in our history. On one occasion Sid went to the Gettysburg battlefield and took the tour of that historical and hallowed battleground. The guide was lecturing upon that battle in supposed sequence and Sid, in his gentlemanly manner said, "I thought it happened this way," and proceeded to describe the battle just as it developed. The guide said, "I see you know as much about this battle as I do and from now on out I will tell you right."

Sid had one of the most analytical and retentive minds of any person I ever knew. Undoubtedly the most complex legislation in our country is in the field of taxation. Sid was a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the committee charged with drawing our tax laws. Sid had a complete grasp of those laws. He never forgot those laws, and after becoming blind, though he could not read the legislation, he heard the legislation read and he knew that legislation second to none.

Mr. Speaker, Sid was every inch American and this was not accidental. Sid was a member of one of Georgia's most illustrious families. The Camps were one of our pioneer families. The Camps fought for American independence, helped frame our laws, and defended our country gallantly in all of our wars. Sid valiantly fought for his country in World War I as a brave soldier in the famous 82d Division. Sid never considered himself as mustered out of his country's service, and on his return home he took up the practice of law, observing in that practice all of the fine ethics of that noble profession. Sid loved right and stood for right, and it was not accidental that he was privileged to serve his State in the general assembly and later honored by an appointment as assistant district attorney. His complete honesty and love for justice, coupled with an unusually brilliant mind naturally made Sid a great credit to his profession. Sid was sent to Congress by his people and remained in this body until God beckoned to him.

Mr. Speaker, we all knew Sid as a great public servant and as one of the most lovable gentlemen it has been our privilege to meet, but the heart and soul of that man were at their finest when we saw Sid as a husband, father and son-in-law. What blessed memories his dear family have to treasure. His complete love for his wife and children will always be an inspiration to me. Mr. Speaker, it is a model for us to follow. Sid's family returned his love in an equal manner. That family love was veritably born in heaven. His family has so much to be thankful for. Sure, they will miss him every day. Everyone will miss Sid, but though we miss Sid, we all know where we can find him. His family is fortunate for they are of the same mold as Sid and they have the blessed privilege of knowing that in heaven where there is no sickness, no sorrow, that even God's house is richer because Sid has come home. Sid's family knows he will be waiting for them to greet them with open arms so that all of them can dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER].

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse everything that has been said about my colleague, SIDNEY CAMP. I had heard of SIDNEY CAMP all my life but had never had the pleasure of meeting him until I came to Congress. I shall never forget his full understanding of a rookie Congressman and his wholehearted desire to help one. He gave me very freely of his experience and knowledge, of which he had much.

I think the highest compliment you can pay any man is to say that he is strictly honest. SIDNEY CAMP had that qualification. In order to be loved you have to love. He loved his family, he loved his colleagues, he loved his country; that is why everyone who knew SIDNEY CAMP loved him.

Mr. Speaker, his family has lost a good husband and father; I have lost a dear friend; the country has lost a great statesman, but what SIDNEY CAMP stood for will live on.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I do not recollect how long ago I became acquainted with SID CAMP. That is not because he made no impression upon me when I came to meet him, but because of Sid's gentle and lovable disposition; once one met him and talked with him, one felt certain he had known him during his entire life. So in the period of my acquaintance with Sid I do not think there has been any time in my life that I did not know him.

I came as a new Member of Congress in 1953 and learned quickly to rely on his counsel. I learned soon to respect and admire his courage and his keen intellect. I had known since my first meeting with SIDNEY CAMP that his personality, his heart, and his character were qualities such that all men could love and say with deep feeling that SID CAMP was a real man.

I remember with vivid recollection the last speech Sid made on the floor of this House. He stood at the microphone on my right here when we had under consideration the bill H. R. 8300, the tax bill, and with a mind as keen and as sharp as any who ever walked on this floor talked about the complexities of that piece of legislation affecting the whole country, seeing none of his audience, but seeing clearly the things which affected the people he represented in his district, his State, and his Nation. But with all of his splendid qualities, I think yes-

terday at the graveside when the Reverend Scotty Young spoke as a friend of man, he portrayed him in the character that Sid really lived and in the light that we really knew and loved him. I want to close my remarks by quoting some stanzas from the poem written by Wilbur D. Nesbit entitled "A Friend or Two." I think it typifies the life of SIDNEY CAMP.

A FRIEND OR TWO

There's all of pleasure and all of peace
In a friend or two;
And all your troubles may find release
With a friend or two;
It's in the grip of the clasping hand
On native soil or in alien land,
But the world is made—do you understand?
Of a friend or two.

A song to sing and a crust to share
With a friend or two;
A smile to give and a grief to bear
With a friend or two;
A road to walk and a goal to win,
An inglenook to find comfort in,
The gladdest hours that we know, begin
With a friend or two.

A little laughter; perhaps some tears
With a friend or two;
The days, the weeks, and the months and years
With a friend or two;
A vale to cross and a hill to climb,
A mock at age and a jeer at time—.
The prose of life takes the lilt of rhyme
With a friend or two.

The brother-soul and the brother-heart
Of a friend or two
Make us drift on from the crowd apart,
With a friend or two;
For come days happy or come days sad
We count no hours but the ones made glad
By the hale good times we have ever had
With a friend or two.

Then brim the goblet and quaff the toast
To a friend or two,
For glad the man who can always boast
Of a friend or two;
The fairest sight is a friendly face,
The blithest tread is a friendly pace,
And heaven will be a better place
For a friend or two.

We who live after him are better because of our friendship with him; America is better because of his life and service; and heaven is better because Sid lives there among "A friend or two."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. REED of New York, of which committee Mr. CAMP was a member.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to perform a task that causes me great sadness. That task is to pay my respects to a departed colleague, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the great State of Georgia.

SID CAMP passed away early Saturday morning, July 24, 1954, after having served in the Congress of the United States since August 1, 1939. During that time his colleagues in the House have without exception learned to love him as a man and respect him as a statesman and patriot. It has been my privilege to join with him in sponsoring many meritorious pieces of legislation, many of which were enacted into public law.

SID CAMP was not only an outstanding Representative of his great State of Georgia, but he was in true measure a statesman who had the national interest always at heart. His colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means took confidence and strength from the presence of SID CAMP during the committee's deliberations on the important legislation pending before it. It is a tribute to his ability as a legislator that his colleagues always listened carefully to his words of counsel and judgment when he rose to speak on the floor of the House.

As a soldier, statesman, and lawyer our colleague, SID CAMP, distinguished himself in his every undertaking. That he will be sorely missed by those whom he has left behind goes without saying. We are richer in wisdom and experience for having known him. We are better prepared to carry on with our daily responsibilities because of the example he has set for us.

I know that if our distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Robert L. Doughton, were present today, he would join with us in expressing sorrow over Mr. CAMP's passing.

It is with somber humility that I utter these few words to SID CAMP's memory.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity in raising my voice to join with my colleagues in paying brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service to our late colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP.

Mr. CAMP and I had many things in common. We both served overseas in the Army in World War I, and both served as department commander of the American Legion of our respective States. We had worked together very closely as members of the Committee on Ways and Means for many years. We cherished a warm friendship that bound us together very closely.

He was a man of great ability and possessed the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He always demonstrated a great devotion to the public service and the welfare and interest of the people of his district and the entire country. The people of his district and State as well as the entire Nation have suffered a great loss in his untimely passing.

I join with my colleagues in conveying my deepest sympathy to the members of his family in the time of their great bereavement.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, when I heard of the death of SIDNEY CAMP I was very deeply moved, because I treasured him as one of the most lovable characters I have ever met. He was loved by every person who ever knew him. As far as I know, he never, at any time, made any derogatory remark about anybody else, and I do not think anybody who ever came in contact with SIDNEY CAMP ever made any derogatory remark about him.

He was not only a gentle soul but he had a most brilliant mind. His word carried weight. His counsel was sought by everybody who knew him. But I should also say this. When he had made up his mind, and knew that he was right, he was a formidable person in carrying his point, because everybody respected not only his strength of character, as being above and beyond what we should expect in most people, but they could not help but feel that any position he took must be nearly right. He was an inspiration to me and I know also to many other Members of Congress. The State of Georgia can justly be proud of him and his unselfish service. Only a divine providence can reward him as richly as he deserves to be rewarded. I will miss him. All of us will miss SIDNEY CAMP.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay humble tribute to my late beloved friend, SIDNEY CAMP. In all the years of my service in this House, in all the meetings and understandings I have had with the membership of this great assembly, I have never met anyone whose association I found so pleasant as that of our late departed friend and colleague. He was possessed of a soul that reflected the noblest character to be found in man. He could convince by the sheer force of his fine character perhaps even more effectively than he could by argument, of the needs of his consituency and of his State and of those people who were in need.

I was pleased on many occasions to aid my good friend solely on the basis of the love and devotion and confidence we had in him, because I knew that whatever SIDNEY CAMP proposed must have been fundamentally correct; that it could not be wrong.

We will miss him in this Chamber. As someone said before me, his place shortly will be filled by another whom the people will send, but we shall never forget the great accomplishments of our late and departed friend and coworker, SIDNEY CAMP. I pray God to rest his weary soul forever.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of SID CAMP's passing. He has answered his last rollcall. His remains have been interred, but his spirit will live on.

I served for 12 years with SID CAMP on the Committee on Ways and Means and learned not only to respect him but also to love him. To his family, his dear wife, and his children, I extend my deepest sympathy. I say to them and I say to you, my colleagues, this world is better because SID CAMP lived.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, bear with me briefly while I try to tell the feeling I had about this distinguished colleague and good friend of ours, SID CAMP, who has just passed from this

earthly scene. I have had the same experience many of you have had because of his friendliness and helpfulness. That I shall never forget. Indeed, no one who knew Sid could ever forget him.

All the beautiful things that have been said about him I endorse. I think all of us could wholeheartedly voice the beautiful sentiment about our friend Sid which is expressed in the lines which I quote as follows:

What deed or merit
Has been mine
That God to me
Should send
Of all his gifts
The most divine
My other soul,
A friend?

Mr. Speaker, SID CAMP was a true friend. I shall miss him very much. His wife and family have my sincere sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of this House with sorrow and grief at the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, SIDNEY CAMP. One could speak for hours about this fine, patriotic gentleman of the highest order but that is not necessary. However, I do want to say that I lived in the same apartment house with SIDNEY CAMP, the Washington House, for the past 12 years, and my office and his adjoined in the Old House Office Building. I learned to know this man and to love him because he was for everything that was big and fine and good for his family, his district, his State, and the Nation.

On many occasions, I would take a taxi with Sidney from the apartment and come to the Old House Office Building. Then he would take my arm and I would guide him to his office, but generally there was one of his office staff waiting for him in front of the Old House Office Building who would tenderly guide him to his office. He had a wonderful office force—so kind and considerate to the man who was their boss and who a few years ago lost the sight of his eyes. I can still see SIDNEY CAMP, and I think SIDNEY CAMP, although he had lost the sight of his eyes, could still see the beauties of everything around him, especially the beauty of one's friendship which he felt so deeply and which emanated from him and everything that he did. He was a great man. I shall miss SIDNEY CAMP as I know he will be missed by a multitude of his friends in his State and here in the House of Representatives, and as I know he will be missed so greatly by his good family. My heart goes out to his wife and family. I know that he is today with the other fine people of this world who have gone to the great beyond. May God rest his soul.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for me to join in the tributes which have been paid to our late, lamented colleague, SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia. It was my privilege to become rather intimately acquainted with him through the years on a subject which I have not heard mentioned here today. He was a great historian and when time permitted, more than once we sat together to discuss that unpleasant period in our history, the War Between the States or the Civil War. As you might suspect, he was named after a great southern leader, Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston, the man who led the Confederate forces at the battle of Shiloh, and who there lost his life. He knew much of the struggle that I did not know, and from him I learned a great deal of southern history in connection with that unpleasant and unhappy period of our history. He saw much even though he could not see with his eyes in later years. I found him to be a perfect gentleman and a fine historian. He was a great American and a good Congressman, and as long as the people of the United States will send to the Congress the same type of high-minded American as ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, there will be no danger that the Stars and Stripes will ever be replaced in this country by the hammer and sickle. I join my colleagues in sending my profound and sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable SIDNEY CAMP, or Sid, as we who knew him endearingly called him, takes from this body one of our most beloved Members. SID CAMP was a man of outstanding ability, of keen and discerning vision, a legislator of courage. And above all his kind and gentle disposition endeared him to all of us. His friends and colleagues for sometime knew of his condition and were deeply concerned about him. But his devotion to duty, when we knew he was suffering great pain, was and always will be an inspiration to us. SID CAMP represented his people in a manner which reflected credit upon them. I know they will always remember this distinguished gentleman for the honorable and trustworthy public service he rendered as their Representative in the Congress. The best evidence of the confidence and respect of his Democratic colleagues is shown by their election of him to the important and responsible assignment as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He loved people. His heart was with those who were sick and suffering, the underprivileged and exploited. To me, a real conservative is a sound progressive. SID CAMP was such a man. He was not only a great American, but SID CAMP was a people's Congressman. His death is a great loss to this body, to our Nation, to SID CAMP'S State, and to his district.

I extend to Mrs. Camp and her son and daughter my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know SIDNEY CAMP very well. I worked with him nearly every day for several years, and we worked on difficult matters, on taxation. He was a Democrat and I am a Republican, but I never doubted him at all because from what he said and what he did he was always understandable and always true. I speak today as having lost a real friend. He was a real man. His wife and his family can always be proud to know that SIDNEY CAMP was one man who served his country and his people well and blamelessly. Peace to his ashes.

Mr. BROWN Of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of the first acquaintances I made when I came to Congress 14 years ago was SIDNEY CAMP. We served on the great Committee on the Judiciary together. He was a lovable person. He was a very able lawyer and he was a very able and distinguished Member of Congress. It was my pleasure to visit with Sid on many occasions, either in or out of committee, on matters of experiences which we had had in our lives in our respective districts. He was a very humane and deeply tolerant individual. I do not remember, either in committee or on the floor of this House, of any intemperate statement that SIDNEY CAMP ever made. He was always tolerant of the other person's viewpoint.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who suffered blindness, who still bore up under it cheerfully, and who did a remarkable job as a Member of this House even after blindness had been visited upon him.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. Sid was a veteran of World War I and had served in a great division that had a magnificent war record. We had no finer or truer patriot in this House than SIDNEY CAMP, and to his family, his district which he so ably represented, and the people of Georgia I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF, Mr. HALEY, and Mr. CAMPBELL] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to SIDNEY CAMP. All of us will remember this distinguished, loyal American from the great State of Georgia for his untiring work on the Ways and Means Committee, and for the warm, friendly, and helpful hand he extended to us as new Members. SID CAMP was never too busy to lend his valuable counsel, advice, and efforts to any project or cause of interest to our Florida congressional delegation. The people of Miami will forever remember his leadership in furthering the establishment of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center at Miami. We in Congress have lost a warm and sincere friend, and the Nation has lost a brilliant, hard-working, and conscientious legislator. To his wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great

American, SIDNEY CAMP, who dedicated his life to the service of his State and his Nation.

With his passing, Georgia has lost one of her noblest sons, the United States has lost one of her greatest citizens, and we have lost one of our most respected and able leaders. SIDNEY CAMP was a man who ever had in his heart and his words the best interests of the United States. His was a life of public service which began with his enlistment in the Army in 1917, when he served with the American Expeditionary Force in France, and found its end in his untimely death during his 13th year in the United States Congress.

Special tribute should be paid to the friendship he gave to new Members of Congress for he was a personal friend and counselor to the inexperienced. As many Congressmen, I am deeply indebted to him for the courtesies and kindnesses he extended to me since my arrival in Congress.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family, his loved ones, and the people of his State who have lost a great Representative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues and pay tribute to our late colleague, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP.

He was truly a great and rugged American. He was keenly interested in his fellowmen and he always had time, a ready hand, and cheery word to help a new Member of Congress over the rough and difficult hurdles. His word was his bond. He loved his native State of Georgia and our Nation is finer for his having dwelled among us. He courageously represented the finest instinct of Christian America.

I offer my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, death has removed one of the finest and one of the most kindly of men; one of the ablest and one of the best loved among our colleagues. As a Member of Congress, few men have inspired greater respect or confidence or have proved more effective in their work than our late colleague, the Honorable ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. As a friend and as a counselor he was an inspiration to all who were privileged to know him. There were many who leaned upon him for guidance and we found him a source of great wisdom and of inestimable help. He had that wonderful knack of being always courteous and considerate, always patient and uncomplaining, even under the terrible physical affliction of his last years.

SID CAMP was a great and a good man. He was one of the best and truest friends I had, and my sense of loss is a deep and personal one. My earnest sympathies are extended to his family, for I know their loss is infinitely greater. His State and Nation mourn his passing, for he will long be missed.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, SID CAMP and I came to the Congress together in the 76th Congress. Since that time our association as friends from time to time has grown to a friendship which I deeply loved.

His daughter and my daughter attended the same school and were associated together. Also he has a nephew at the present time at Duke University who is known as one of the finest surgeons in the world. He probably saved my life. So I feel very heavily indebted to the Camp family.

Looking back over history, if you care to, you will find that the Camp family was probably one of the most outstanding and important families in the development of his part of the South which today is so well known. He was, as has been previously referred to, a great historian. He was also a great friend, a very close friend, of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was the first man to place him in the pool at Warm Springs, Ga., before Mr. Roosevelt became Governor of the great State of New York. Down through the years, and even when Mr. CAMP was here in Congress, a friendship existed which he never mentioned, but it was very close and the association was frequent.

I still like to think of SID CAMP as being probably one of the greatest epicurians of his day. If you had ever attended his home or apartment, you would know that he could prepare as fine a meal as anyone ever sat down to partake.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family. I will miss Sid. Every man who served here in this body of course is due rank. SID CAMP down through his years of service here ranked as one of the great men that has come and served in this body. And his family and children can look back on history in the years to come on a father that ranks among the great men of this time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the curtain of death has been drawn on a noble and illustrious life and the work and career of a fine man ends. It has been my pleasure to know and work with ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP and to form an opinion of him that placed him among the illustrious of this Nation.

When I heard of the passing of this good friend of mine I was deeply grieved. He was a grand American and rendered invaluable services, both in private and public life. He was held in the highest esteem and admiration by all of his colleagues and by all the citizens of the great State of Georgia. We have lost a valuable Member and the State of Georgia has lost a great public servant.

I feel a distinct personal loss in the passing of Sid. Being native fellow Georgians, we formed a friendship that grew through our association.

May God bless and sustain his bereaved family in this, their hour of sorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of our deceased colleague at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP was a real man—noble, good, and great. He had in him all of the fine and outstanding elements of a great American—to his family I convey my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the ability with words to express my sorrow and regret at the passing of Congressman SID CAMP; but I can and do say that I miss him as a true and wonderful friend of mine since I first came to Congress. He was always anxious to be of help and he was always helpful for he was an able statesman. He leaves behind him a memorial of love in the hearts of the thousands who knew and loved him. I pray that his beloved family may take comfort in their sorrow by contemplating the good way in which he used his life at all times.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues from the great State of Georgia, I would share with them in the loss all of us feel in the passing of our beloved colleague, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP.

I especially recall his courageous devotion to duty and country no matter how great a physical handicap he was suffering, and this was particularly true during the last few months of his life when his physical condition was a source of such concern to him. I see him now walking up the corridors, entering the elevator, walking through the tunnel, or entering the House Restaurant, being guided by some faithful and loyal staff member.

His keen mind, devotion to duty and care for others were immediately noticeable when he was spoken to. Even though he lived in a little world of his own and was not able to see his friends, he knew their voices and would immediately respond by calling them by their first name. He lived in a way that will ever challenge those of us whom he has left behind.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I share the sadness of my colleagues in the untimely death of our friend and fellow Member, Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. I appreciate the feelings of the other Members of the House; however, I believe that I can say that SID CAMP's death was more of a shock to me than to most Members of the House, because I not only had the privilege of serving with him in the House, I also had the privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Ways and Means.

SID CAMP was one of the most highly respected members of our committee. This respect was given him not only because he was a true gentleman in every sense of the word, but also because of his integrity and his knowledge and understanding of the legislation which our committee handled.

Mr. CAMP's wit and good humor were a continuous source of pleasure to the members of the committee. On many occasions, after days of hard and continuous work, SID CAMP would break the pressure and tension of our work with his homely sayings and comments.

SID CAMP's humility was matched only by his patriotism and devotion to duty. He was a man who always kept the interests of his constituents uppermost in his mind, and who would listen to any and all persons with kindness and understanding whenever they had a problem, be it personal or legislative, about which they came to see him.

I can think of few men with whom I have had the pleasure of serving in the House who were held in higher esteem than SID CAMP. His contribution to his State and the Nation will long last as a monument to his untiring and inspiring work.

The State of Georgia has lost a great champion. The Nation has lost a great statesman, and we all have lost a good friend.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Camp, the children, and the family.

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the long and faithful public service of the Hon. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia, our former colleague and my good friend, is common knowledge. His devotion to his country, his State, and his people is a matter of historical record. Our testimony here regarding his service and his accomplishments in this field of endeavor evidences our knowledge and appreciation of his work.

He and I were reared in similar environments and under like conditions in small towns in the great State of Georgia. We attended different but similar public schools, and both of us completed our education at the University of Georgia.

During my first days of service here he graciously and with his customary friendliness gave me much valuable help and counsel. He contributed much toward my better understanding of the procedures and work methods of this great legislative body and encouraged me to a stronger determination through hope and faith to join with him and others here to strive for what seems best for our country and its people.

Frequently, when we could find leisure time from our congressional duties, we visited together in his office. I treasure those visits and my recollections of his interesting and informative stories which not only told of people, incidents, and events, but evidenced his sympathetic understanding and devotion to his people. He had a profound and inspiring Christian philosophy of service. His love and affection for the members of his family and his loyalty to his friends and his country were basic characteristics. He had to a remarkable degree forebearance, patience, and consideration in dealing with others.

He unselfishly helped others, and because of his talents, ability, and tenacity of purpose accomplished much. He was loved and respected and will be greatly missed.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of the House, I was deeply grieved over news of the passing of our beloved colleague, SIDNEY CAMP. I first knew him when he was an assistant United States attorney in the Georgia district adjoining the district in Tennessee that I had the honor of serving. We had many cases and other matters together in which the Government was involved. I found him then to be a lawyer of great ability, of exceptionally good judgment, and always preeminently fair.

Representative CAMP came to Congress many years before I did, but upon my arrival here he was one of the first to welcome me. He was most kind and helpful to me, as he was to all new Members who were privileged to know him. SIDNEY CAMP was a really great legislator, possessed of exceptionally fine judgment and unusual ability. The State of Georgia and the Nation have lost a great Representative, and we who served with him in the House have lost a loyal, devoted, and true friend.

I wish to join with my colleagues in exending to Mrs. Camp and other members of the family my deepest sympathy. We will all miss SID CAMP.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the death of our colleague SIDNEY CAMP.

I have been enriched by the experience of knowing SIDNEY CAMP. No person could know Sid without profiting by the association.

He was a true gentleman in every sense of the word. Kind, considerate, friendly and tolerant, he was never too busy to lend a helping hand or a word of encouragement. He loved his native State of Georgia. Many times I have had the opportunity to sit and visit with Sid. He never tired of recounting the history and progress of his State. As he loved Georgia, I am sure that the people of Georgia loved him. My sincere sympathy is extended to the people of Georgia and to his family. They and the Nation have suffered a real loss. I have lost a fine and inspiring friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as the Members recall it was near the end of a long night's session when the news of the death of our beloved friend, SIDNEY CAMP was announced. I walked from the Chamber with a heavy heart, paused in the House Office Building for a little while, and then walked to my home east of the Capitol. The memory of our recent association was fresh in my mind. I had been privileged to know him more intimately since moving to his corridor about the time his vision failed, and out of this experience came an appreciation of qualities I had not known before. We all observed his fine performance as a legislator and were happy over the recognition he had received as a public servant. The State of Georgia and his family could indeed be proud of his achievements.

But the qualities to which I allude involved something more than a great professional career. He was a man of deep sensibilities and spiritual insight. He had told me of his enjoyment of the books which the Library provided through recorded readings and of his new appreciation for music. His uncomplaining attitude and the evidence of a deep faith were a great inspiration to those of us who had the privilege of being with him in this period of his life.

As the dawn faintly appeared on that Saturday morning walk I recalled the familiar lines of a great American poet, lines to strengthen us in the loss of friends:

> Alas for him * * *
> Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
> Nor looks to see the breaking day
> Across the mournful marbles play!
> Who hath not learned, in hours of faith,
> The truth to flesh and sense unknown
> That life is ever lord of death,
> And love can never lose its own!

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, again the Grim Reaper has silently entered the portals of this Chamber and taken from us one of our most beloved brothers. SIDNEY CAMP was one of that rare company of men who had courage without compromise, wisdom without pride, and love without dissimulation. As his companionship will be missed in his home, so will his good counsel be missed in this body.

I join with my colleagues in extending our sympathy to the members of his immediate family. With them we shall mourn his loss while we are yet proud to have been his friend.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our esteemed and beloved colleague and friend, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, has come as a profound shock to all of us. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to one whom we all admired and shall greatly miss.

The devoted family of Congressman CAMP has been deprived beyond measure. We of this body have been deprived of an inspirational colleague. The people of Georgia and the Nation have lost a faithful and able public servant whose views and efforts were devoted to the welfare of all.

ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP—or Sid, as he was known affectionately to all of us—dedicated his life to public service. His efforts and achievements in behalf of the people whom he represented were numerous. He distinguished himself as a quiet, but effective member of the great Committee on Ways and Means where he served with great ability and diligence.

His years in the Congress covered years of the most critical nature our Nation has ever experienced—and throughout the crisis and dark hours his wise and reasonable actions, speech and influence were at all times apparent and were a bulwark of strength.

In deep regret and in sadness we know that Sid will no longer be with us. He will be greatly missed.

I wish personally to extend to his bereaved family my deepest sympathy in their loss which, because of the caliber of their loved one, is also the loss of our Nation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply mourn the loss of our colleague, ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, and wish to join the other Members of the House in paying tribute to him and in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife, son and daughter, and other members of his family. I feel a keen sense of loss in his passing away as he and I were very warm, close personal friends of many years standing. We became good friends soon after I became a Member of the House and our friendship ripened and became

warmer each year. I had such an abiding affection and high regard for him and was proud to call him one of my best and closest friends in Congress.

Over the past 12 years I have spent many happy hours in his company and I never knew a finer, more honorable, more courteous, or more affable gentleman. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP was the soul of honor and integrity and he was always an inspiration to me. I will forever cherish the privilege of having served with him in Congress and the memory of the generous friendship he gave to me. He was a man of courage, of deep convictions, of humility, and a keen sense of justice. He was absolutely sincere and frank at all times and was wholly free of hatred, sham, pretense, and hypocrisy.

He loved people and friends and was a most interesting conversationalist and a keen student of history and government. His knowledge of the various battles of the Civil War was remarkable.

He was a plain, simple, humble man. He was a good, kindly man who was always eager to do something to help his fellow man. His many valuable contributions through a long and useful career will stand as a monument to his memory. He served our country nobly and courageously both in time of war and in time of peace, having served over 2 years, including overseas duty, with the 82d Division in World War I and having served as Assistant United States Attorney in Atlanta, Ga., before becoming a Member of Congress, where he served with honor, credit, and distinction for 15 years. He was a person of intense, deep convictions and principles and was truly a conscientious public servant. He always had the admiration and respect of his colleagues in the House and never did I hear any Member say a critical or unkind word of him. He was a good Samaritan at all times and his career was a life of service to mankind. He was truly one of God's noblemen. His countless good deeds will long be remembered and his fine sense of justice and his devotion to duty will not be forgotten. ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP was indeed a great American and an outstanding statesman.

I attended his funeral services in his home town of Newnan, Ga., along with Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress and our colleague, Representative NOBLE J. GREGORY, of Kentucky, yesterday afternoon and his many friends not only from his home town and county and from the other counties of his congressional district but from other sections of the State of Georgia were gathered there to pay their last respects. They truly mourned his loss and were deeply grieved and saddened as he was loved and admired by all classes of people in his State. He left a good name and a rich heritage to his family and his many friends. All of us will deeply miss him.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it is somehow very difficult to realize that SID CAMP is no longer with us.

SID CAMP was a quiet man, a gentle man. He spoke rarely; and when he did, his words were measured and soft. But he walked in the mantle of greatness. He carried with him the grand traditions of an age when men were calm and diliberate; when they always weighed their words before they uttered them.

His kindliness and his courtesy were not acquired characteristics which could be shed like a cloak or a pair of gloves. They were part of his inner soul—of the inner recesses of his being.

SID CAMP was a wise man—a man of profound and balanced judgment. He had a deep understanding of the working and machinery of our Government, an understanding that is denied to most men.

He also had a basic sympathy for the problems of his fellow man—a sympathy which enabled him to comprehend the problems of people.

As a young Member of this House, I went to SID CAMP with many problems. He was my neighbor from the great State of Georgia. I always found his advice to be sound. I found his heart to be gentle and considerate.

Life is uncertain, and none of us knows how long he may be able to serve his country or his fellow man. One of the memories I shall always cherish is the loving memory of ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. He was one of the gentlest and kindest men it has ever been my priviledge to know.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to add my personal tribute to the eloquent ones paid by my colleagues to the memory of our late friend and associate, the Honorable ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. Mr. CAMP was gentle, kindly, warm, and friendly, courageous in his personal and public life, firm in his principles and convictions, and deeply beloved by his colleagues and by all who knew him.

In remembering his sterling character, so well known to all of us and so well described by our colleagues who knew and loved him best, I am strongly reminded of two poems which were favorites of my late husband, the Honorable John Kee. The first of these poems was written by James Whitcomb Riley and was entitled "Our Kind of a Man." It was often quoted by Judge Kee in connection with friends for whom he had a particular admiration and respect. It seems to me that this poem reflects the feeling that all of us had for Mr. CAMP:

The kind of a man for you and me.
He faces the world unflinchingly,
And smites, as long as the wrong resists,
With a knuckled faith and force like fists:
He lives the life he is preaching of,
And loves where most is the need of love;
His voice is clear to the deaf man's ears;
And his face sublime through the blind man's tears;
The light shines out where the clouds were dim,
And the widow's prayer goes up for him;
The latch is clicked at the hovel door
And the sick man sees the sun once more,
And out o'er the barren fields he sees
Springing blossoms and waving trees,
Feeling as only the dying may,
That God's own servant has come that way,
Smoothing the path as it still winds on
Through the golden gate where his loved have gone.

The second poem is one that I found while going through some of Judge Kee's papers after his death. I am sorry that I do not know whether he composed it, or whether he had copied it just because it appealed to him. Anyway, it seems to me that Mr. CAMP exemplified the spirit and meaning of this poem in all that he did and said, for he was never known to say anything unkind about ayone. What a great thing it would be if more people in public life could follow his example and practice his generous and kindly philosophy. This poem is entitled "I Know Something Good About You":

Wouldn't this old world be better
If the folks we met would say—
"I know something good about you."
And treat us just that way?

Wouldn't it be fine and dandy
If each handclasp, fond and true,
Carried with it this assurance
"I know something good about you."

Wouldn't life be lots more happy
If the good that's in us all,
Were the only thing about us
That folks bothered to recall?

Wouldn't life be lots more happy
If we praised the good we see,
For there's such a lot of goodness
In the worst of you and me.

Wouldn't it be nice to practice
That fine way of thinking, too?
You know something good about me;
"I know something good about you."

I join with all of my colleagues in mourning the loss of ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP and in being grateful for the privilege of having known him. I hope that his loved ones may be comforted in their deep sorrow by the knowledge that all of us mourn and are with them in the spirit of loving sympathy and understanding.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, SID CAMP was one of the first men I met after I came to Washington. Both of us were named for that great general of the Confederacy, Albert Sidney Johnston. Right off we had something in common. We always addressed each other as "Albert Sidney." I believe he knew every detail of the life of the distinguished man whose name we bore. We must have fought the Battle of Shiloh a dozen times.

These memories certainly make you feel close to a man, and I was devoted to SID CAMP. He was a great and able Representative, with a heart as big as a house. He was never too busy to help some other Member. I know how much he has helped me.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones in their and America's great loss.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, a kind and great figure in the Congress passed with the death of our beloved colleague, SIDNEY CAMP. I can think of no more generous or considerate person.

I shall always think of SIDNEY CAMP as sort of a pool of sunlight. He had that manner about him which blends cheerfulness and encouragement in all situations. Even when Sid lost his sight, his cheerful attitude was not affected. He was always ready to stop for a moment and chat in a neighborly way. I feel that I have lost a dear friend.

The people of Puerto Rico whom I represent owed a special debt of gratitude to SIDNEY CAMP as one of those in the Congress who took particular concern with problems affecting Puerto Rico, and which were the subject of legislation. For example, it was he who was largely instrumental in having the social-security program extended to Puerto Rico. This was one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation for Puerto Rico which ever passed the Congress.

I believe that the extension of social security to Puerto Rico was a direct result of investigations conducted by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee which visited Puerto Rico in 1949 under the able chairmanship of SIDNEY CAMP. In a way, it will be his monument in Puerto Rico.

DISASTER RELIEF ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 479)

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Public Works and ordered to be printed.

(For President's message see pp. 11929–11932 of the Senate proceedings of Saturday, July 24, 1954.)

VISIT OF MADEMOISELLE GENEVIEVE DE GALARD-TERRAUBE—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, together with a letter from Mademoiselle Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, which were read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 23, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to transmit herewith a letter addressed to me by Mademoiselle Genevieve de Galard-Terraube accepting the invitation of the Congress to visit the United States and asking that her thanks be submitted to the Congress.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[Translation of letter to the President from Mademoiselle de Galard]

JUNE 28, 1954.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am profoundly touched by the great honor which it has pleased the American Congress to do me by inviting me to go to the United States. This honor belongs to all those whose lot I proudly shared for nearly 2 months and to all the nurses who, in a more obscure situation, sought to relieve the suffering of the wounded. It is on these terms that I accept with gratitude the invitation of the Congress.

In accepting this invitation I am mindful of all the families in mourning, of all those who are still out there, of those who battle and those who are in the prison camps and who, more than I, merit the honor which is paid me; their thought will stay with me and without doubt my taking to the people of the United States an echo of their heroic courage will be of a continuing aid to them.

The American Nation will understand my feelings all the better in that at this very moment it is making a generous contribution to the repatriation of the wounded of Indochina. I shall be happy, upon the occasion of my visit, to express the gratitude of the French families for this gesture which translates so well the traditional friendship of our two countries.

I beg Your Excellency to please transmit my most humble thanks to the Congress of the United States and to accept the assurances of my profoundly respectful sentiments.

GENEVIEVE DE GALARD.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10009) to provide for the review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for the tariff classification of unenumerated articles, to repeal or amend obsolete provisions of the customs laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this bill was reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means. Those of us on this side are agreeable to the request of the gentleman from New York.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Customs Simplification Act of 1954."

TITLE I—REVIEW OF CUSTOMS TARIFF SCHEDULES

SEC. 101. (a) The United States Tariff Commission shall proceed promptly to make a complete study of all provisions of the customs laws of the United States under which imported articles may be classified for the purpose of determining the applicable rate of duty or exemption from duty, including the dutiable and free lists and certain special provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and as modified, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the duties designated as import taxes, as amended and as modified, and other laws. The Commission shall compile a revision and consolidation of such provisions of the customs laws which, in the judgment of the Commission, will accomplish to the extent practicable the following purposes:

(1) Established schedules of tariff classifications which will be logical in arrangement and terminology and adapted to the changes which have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles produced in and imported into the United States and in the markets in which they are sold.

(2) Eliminate anomalies and illogical results in the classification of articles.

(3) Simplify the determination and application of tariff classifications with respect to particular products by (i) eliminating multiple provisions for the tariff treatment of the same product; (ii) revising tariff descriptions; (iii) establishing a single classification provision for each group of articles which are subject now to different classifications but which are similar in character and in competitive relationship to products of the United States; (iv) changing forms of rates of duty; and (v) establishing consistent and simplified principles and standards of tariff classification.

(b) The schedules prepared in accordance with subsection (a) shall specify two recommended rates of duty for each classification provision in the dutiable schedules, which rates may be identical or different. Such rates shall be respectively (1) the rate, or equal in ad valorem equivalent to the rate or rates, applicable on the date of completion of the schedules (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress) to articles covered by such classification provision which are products of countries whose products are not at that time entitled to the benefits of reduced rates of duty established pursuant to trade agreements entered into under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 1351), and (2) the rate, or equal in ad valorem equivalent to the rate or rates, applicable on the date of completion of the schedules (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress) to articles covered by such classification provision which are products of countries, other than Cuba and the Philippine Republic, whose products are at that time entitled to the benefits of rates of duty established pursuant to the aforesaid trade agreements. For the purposes of specifying all rates of duty in the schedules, such tolerances shall be applied as the Commission shall deem appropriate to round out the rates within reasonable standards of uniformity. If the Commission in preparing its schedules changes the form of the rate of any duty, or establishes a single classification provision for a group of articles formerly subject to different rates of duty, the revised rates, whether ad valorem, specific, or compound, shall be those which, in the judgment of the Commission, will bring substantially the same amount of duties as would have been collected by application of the superseded rate or rates, based upon reasonably available information as to the amounts of duties which were and would have been collected on imports entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the calendar years 1952 and 1953.

(c) The schedules prepared in accordance with the preceding subsections, shall be accompanied by a statement of the amount of each difference between an existing rate and the corresponding rate in the schedule, based upon reasonably available information as to the amounts of duties which were, and which by application of the schedule rates would have been, collected on imports entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the calendar years 1952 and 1953. They shall also be accompanied by summaries of all the data on the basis of which the new rates in the schedules were calculated.

(d) Not later than 2 years after the enactment of this act the Commission shall transmit copies of the schedules and accompanying data to the President and to the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(e) On or before March 15, 1955, the Commission shall report to the President and to the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate (1) the progress that has been made in carrying out the provisions of this section, (2) the significant complexities of tariff classification that have been developed as existing in the present law, and (3) suggestions as to standards and methods which might be adopted for a simplification of existing tariff schedules without significant changes in tariff levels.

(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to enable the United States Tariff Commission to carry out the functions assigned to it by this section.

TITLE II—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF UNENUMERATED ARTICLES

SEC. 201. Paragraph 1559 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1559), is amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1559. (a) Each and every imported article, not enumerated in this act, which is similar in the use to which it may be applied to any article enumerated in this act as chargeable with duty, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as the enumerated article which it most resembles in the particular before mentioned; and if any nonenumerated article equally resembles in that particular two or more enumerated articles on which different rates of duty are chargeable, it shall be subject to the rate of duty applicable to that one of such two or more articles which it most resembles in respect of the materials of which it is composed.

"(b) The words 'component of chief value,' wherever used in this act, shall be held to mean that component material which shall exceed in value any other single component material of the article involved; and the value of each component material shall be determined by the ascertained value of such material in its condition as found in the article.

"(c) If two or more enumerations shall be equally applicable to any article, it shall be subject to duty at the highest rate prescribed for any such enumeration."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE ANTIDUMPING ACT, 1921

SEC. 301. Section 201 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 160), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter called the 'Secretary') determines that a class or kind of foreign merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, he shall so advise the United States Tariff Commission, and the said Commission shall determine within 3 months thereafter whether an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation of such merchandise into the United States. The said Commission, after such investigation as it deems necessary, shall notify the Secretary of its determination, and, if that determination is in the affirmative, the Secretary shall make public a notice (hereinafter in this act called a 'finding') of his determination and the determination of the said Commission. The Secretary's finding shall include a description of the class or kind of merchandise to which it applies in such detail as he shall deem necessary for the guidance of customs officers.

"(b) Whenever, in the case of any imported merchandise of a class or kind as to which the Secretary has not so made public a finding, the Secretary has reason to believe or suspect, from information presented to him, that the purchase price is less, or that the exporter's sale price is less or likely to be less, than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the cost of production), he shall forthwith authorize, under such regulations as he may prescibe, the withholding of appraisement reports as to such merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, not more than 60 days before the question of dumping has been presented to him, until the further order of the Secretary, or until the Secretary has made public a finding as provided for in subdivision (a) in regard to such merchandise."

SEC. 302. Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 161 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In the case of all imported merchandise, whether dutiable or free of duty, of a class or kind as to which the Secretary of the Treasury has made public a finding as provided for in section 201, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, not more than 60 days before the question of dumping was presented to the Secretary, and as to which no appraisement report has been made before such finding has been so made public, if the purchase price or the exporter's sale price is less than the foreign market value (or in the absence of such value, than the cost of production) there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to any other duties imposed thereon by law, a special dumping duty in an amount equal to such difference."

TITLE IV—IMPORTATIONS FROM INSULAR POSSESSIONS

SEC. 401. Part I of title III of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, subtitle III, pt. I), is further amended by inserting at the beginning thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 301. Insular possessions.

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from any of its insular possessions, except Puerto Rico, the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries; except that all articles the growth or product of any such possession, or manufactured or produced in any such possession from materials the growth, product, or manufacture of any such possession or of the United States, or of both, which do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 50 percent of their total value, coming into the United States directly from any such possession, and all articles previously imported into the United States with payment of all applicable duties and taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation which are shipped from the United States, without remission, refund, or drawing back of such duties or taxes, directly to the possession from which it is being returned by direct shipment, shall be admitted free of duty upon compliance with such regulations as to proof of origin as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. In determining whether an article produced or manufactured in any such insular possession contains foreign materials to the value of more than 50 percent, no material shall be considered foreign which, at the time such article is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, in the United States for consumption, may be imported into the United States from a foreign country, other than Cuba or the Philippine Republic, free of duty."

SEC. 402. (a) Section 3 of the act of March 3, 1917 (39 Stat. 1133), as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 48, sec. 1394), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. All articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands shall be subject to or exempt from duty as provided for in section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and subject to internal-revenue taxes as provided for in section 3350 of the Internal Revenue Code."

(b) Section 27 of the act of August 1, 1950 (64 Stat. 392; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 48, sec. 1421e), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. All articles coming into the United States from Guam shall be subject to or exempt from duty as provided for in section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930."

TITLE V—OBSOLETE PROVISIONS OF CUSTOMS LAWS

SEC. 501. The following obsolete, inoperative, and unnecessary statutes and parts thereof relating to the duties, functions, and operations of certain officers and employees of the Customs Service are repealed:

1. Section 2649, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 12).
2. Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1911 (ch. 285, 36 Stat. 1393), as amended, and so much of the acts of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 152), March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 968), March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1393), and March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1453), as relate to the number and titles of special agents or members of the Customs Special Agency Service (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 13).
3. Section 2651, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 14).
4. Section 2999, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 15).
5. Section 2940, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 16).
6. Section 2941, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 17).
7. Section 2942, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 18).
8. Section 2616, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 21).
9. Section 2614, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 22).
10. Section 2615, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 23).
11. Section 2617, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 24).
12. Section 2611, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 26).
13. Section 11 of the act of February 8, 1875 (c. 36; 18 Stat. 309), as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 27).
14. Act of September 24, 1914 (ch. 309, 38 Stat. 716; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 28).
15. Section 2627, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 40).
16. Section 2687, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 53).
17. Section 2646, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 54).
18. Section 2647, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 55).
19. Section 2944, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 56).
20. Section 2648, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 57).
21. Section 2635, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 59).
22. Section 2580, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 61).
23. Act of December 18, 1890 (ch. 22, 26 Stat. 690), as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 62).
24. Section 258, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 67).
25. Section 2612, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 379).
26. Section 2918, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 390).
27. Section 13 of the act of June 22, 1874 (ch. 391, 18 Stat. 188, U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 494).
28. Act of February 10, 1913 (ch. 35, 37 Stat. 665; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 542).
29. Section 3650, Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 31, sec. 549).
30. So much of section 3689 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 31, sec. 711 (7)) as reads: "Repayment of excess of deposits for unascertained duties (customs): To repay to importers the excess of deposits for unascertained duties, or duties or other moneys paid under protest."
31. So much of section 1 of the act of September 30, 1890 (ch. 1126, 26 Stat. 511), as reads: "And such clerks and inspectors of

customs as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate for the purpose shall be authorized to administer oaths, such as deputy collectors of customs are now authorized to administer, and no compensation shall be paid or charge made therefor."

SEC. 502. Subsection (f) of section 500 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1500 (f)) is amended by deleting from the second sentence the words "take the oath,".

SEC. 503. Section 583 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1583) is amended by deleting therefrom the words "the back of."

TITLE VI—CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. (a) The parenthetical matter first appearing in the second sentence of section 4197 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 91), is amended to read as follows: "(other than a licensed yacht or an undocumented American pleasure vessel not engaged in any trade nor in any way violating the customs or navigation laws of the United States)."

(b) Section 441 (3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1441 (3)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(3) Licensed yachts or undocumented American pleasure vessels not engaged in trade nor in any way violating the customs or navigation laws of the United States and not having visited any hovering vessel: *Provided,* That the master of any such vessel which has on board any article required by law to be entered shall be required to report such article to the collector within 24 hours after arrival."

(c) Sections 4218 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 106), is repealed.

SEC. 602. Section 3062 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 483), relating to forfeitures and penalties for aiding unlawful importation, is repealed, and in lieu thereof there is inserted in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, immediately after section 595 thereof (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1595) the following new section:

"SEC. 596. Aiding unlawful importation

"(a) Every vessel, vehicle, animal, aircraft, or other thing used in, to aid in, or to facilitate, by obtaining information or in any other way, the importation, bringing in, unlading, landing, removal, concealing, harboring, or subsequent transportation of any article which is being or has been introduced, or attempted to be introduced, into the United States contrary to law, whether upon such vessel, vehicle, animal, aircraft, or other thing or otherwise shall be seized and forfeited together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, harness, or equipment.

"(b) Every person who directs, assists financially or otherwise, or is in any way concerned in any unlawful activity mentioned in the preceding subsection shall be liable to a penalty equal to the value of the article or articles introduced or attempted to be introduced."

SEC. 603. (a) The first two sentences of section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1451), are further amended to read as follows: "Before any such special license to unlade shall be granted, the master, owner, or agent of such vessel or vehicle, or the person in charge of such vehicle, shall be required to deposit sufficient money to pay, or to give a bond in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary conditioned to pay, the compensation and expenses of the customs officers and employees assigned to duty in connection with such unlading at night or on Sunday or a holiday, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 267). In lieu of such deposit or bond the owner or agent of any vessel or vehicle or line of vessels or vehicles may execute a bond in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury to cover and include the issuance of special licenses for the unlading of such vessels or vehicles for a period not to exceeld 1 year."

(b) The third sentence of section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1451), is further amended by inserting "deposits sufficient money to pay, or" after the words "person requesting such services" now appearing therein and by deleting the words "a penal sum" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "an amount."

SEC. 604. Section 581 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1581 (d)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any vessel or vehicle which, at any authorized place, is directed to come to a stop by any officer of the customs, or is directed to come to a stop by signal made by any vessel employed in the service of the customs and displaying proper insignia, shall come to a stop, and upon failure to comply a vessel or vehicle so directed to come to a stop shall become subject to pursuit and the master, owner, operator, or person in charge thereof shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $5,000 nor less than $1,000."

SEC. 605. Section 605 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1605), as amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Pending such disposition, the property shall be stored in such place as, in the collector's opinion, is most convenient and appropriate with due regard to the expense involved, whether or not the place of storage is within the judicial district or the customs collection district in which the property was seized; and storage of the property outside the judicial district or customs collection district in which it was seized shall in no way affect the jurisdiction of the court which would otherwise have jurisdiction over such property."

SEC. 606. Sections 607, as amending, 610, and 612 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 19, secs. 1607, 1610, 1612) are amended by deleting "$1,000" wherever that amount is stated therein and substituting "$2,500."

SEC. 607. Section 545 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "this section" in the fifth paragraph the following ", or the value thereof, to be recovered from any person described in the first or second paragraph of this section."

TITLE VII—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 701. Titles II, III, IV, and VI of this act shall be effective on and after the 30th day following the date of the 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.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10009 which was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee is intended to continue the program of customs simplification and management improvement in accordance with the recommendation of the President's message to the Congress on foreign economic policy of March 30, 1954. This bill, the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, is a further development and continuation of the program initiated by the Customs Simplification Act of 1953. The present bill will accomplish the following purposes:

First. Begin the work necessary to bring about a revision of the tariff classification schedules, a job which has not been done since the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930, and also the procedures for the classification of unenumerated articles pending an overall revision of the tariff;

Second. Make certain procedural changes in the Antidumping Act, 1921, which will permit more efficient consideration and determination of dumping cases;

Third. Eliminate certain inconsistencies in the present law relating to the application of duties to products of our insular possessions;

Fourth. Repeal a number of obsolete provisions relating to the customs service; and

Fifth. Adopt a number of procedural changes designed to permit the Bureau of Customs to enforce the customs laws more effectively.

H. R. 9476 was introduced in this session of Congress, based on suggestions by the Treasury Department and designed to carry out certain recommendations of the President's message of March 30 on foreign economic policy. The Committee on Ways and Means held extensive public hearings on H. R. 9476. After consideration in executive session H. R. 10009 was introduced to embody the committee's decisions on the questions involved.

We have been informed by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury during the public hearings that the enactment of the Customs Simplification Act of 1953, sponsored by your committee during the last session of Congress, has been largely instrumental in bringing about a substantial decrease in the backlog of uncompleted customs work. This reversed a trend which had been uninterrupted since the end of the war. In my opinion the enactment of this bill will aid the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Customs further to increase efficiency.

Title I of the bill relates to tariff classification. At the present time there are probably more than 8,000 distinct duty classifications for tariff purposes. A businessman in this country desiring to import a new product must necessarily determine the correct duty classification. Since the tariff classification descriptions were drafted in the light of the known commodities involved in international trade in the late 1920's, even experienced importers and administrative officials frequently find difficulty in deciding which tariff classification is correct.

These difficulties are complicated by the fact that the tariff classification schedules do not follow any systematic or uniform pattern or set of principles.

The bill authorizes the Tariff Commission to begin immediately the review necessary to propose a revision of the

tariff schedules in order to avoid any loss of time.

Without providing for putting any revision into effect, the bill requires that the study by the Tariff Commission be completed in 2 years and that it result in the preparation of revised schedules to be transmitted to the President and to the chairman of the appropriate committees of Congress, accompanied by summary statements of all the data on which the new descriptions or rates were based and all differences between existing and suggested rates.

The bill also requires the Tariff Commission to report to the Congress by March 15, 1955, its views and recommendations based upon its preliminary studies as to the appropriate standards and methods to be adopted for a simplification of existing tariff schedules without significant changes in tariff levels. With the benefit of these recommendations, the Congress can more effectively consider legislation to implement the revision proposed by the Tariff Commission. In suggesting methods for simplifying the schedules the Commission will, of course, take into consideration the problem of adjusting trade-agreement commitments to any proposed tariff revision.

The bill provides that under antidumping proceedings the determination of injury to domestic industry can be more effectively made by the Tariff Commission than by the Secretary of the Treasury. Title III of the bill therefore transfers this function to that Commission, thus leading to more efficient administration of the antidumping law. It is expected, of course, that the Commission will give interested parties notice of the institution of an injury investigation and will afford them reasonable opportunity to present their views at public hearings.

Titles II, IV, V, and VI are administrative measures to repeal or correct outmoded or cumbersome provisions of the customs law. These titles are explained in the section-by-section discussion of the report.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATIONS FOR PERIOD OF AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 560) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1954, to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. This is a joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1954, to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1954 Convention Corp. on the occasion of such convention, which will last for a period of probably 1 week.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the American Legion National Convention to be held in the District of Columbia for the period from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, the Commissioners are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to charge such fees for such privilege, as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents; the term "Corporation" means the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation of the District of Columbia; and the term "convention" means the American Legion National Convention of 1954 to be held in Washington, D. C., on August 29, 30, and 31 and September 1 and 2, 1954.

SEC. 3. The Superintendent of National Capital Parks with the approval of such officer as may exercise jurisdiction over any of the Federal reservations or grounds in the District of Columbia, other than those areas under the jurisdiction of the Congress or any committee thereof, is authorized to grant to the corporation permits for the use of such reservations or grounds during the convention, including a reasonable time prior and subsequent thereto; the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to grant like permits for the use of those areas under the jurisdiction of the Congress or any committee thereof; and the Commissioners are authorized to grant like permits for the use of public space under their jurisdiction, including the grounds and stadia of the public schools. Each such permit shall be subject to such restrictions, terms, and conditions as may be imposed by the grantor of such permit. No stand or other structure shall be built on any sidewalk, street, park, reservation or other public grounds in the District of Columbia, except with the approval of the corporation, and with the approval of the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, the Architect of the Capitol, or the Commissioners, as the case may be, depending on the location of such stand. The reservations, grounds, or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall, after the convention, be promptly restored to their previous condition. The corporation shall idemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the appropriate agency or agencies of the Federal Government against any loss or damage to such property and against any liability arising from the use of such property, either by the corporation or a licensee of the corporation.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the corporation to install suitable overhead conductors and install suitable lighting or other electrical facilities, with adequate supports, for illumination or other purposes. If it should be necessary to place wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, such placing of wires and their removal shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation. Such conductors with their supports shall be removed on or before September 15, 1954. The Commissioners, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, shall enforce the provisions of this joint resolution, take needful precautions for the protection of the public, and insure that the pavement of any street, sidewalk, avenue, or alley which is disturbed or damaged is restored to its previous condition. No expense or damage from the installation, operation, or removal of said temporary overhead conductors or said illumination or other electrical facilities shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia, and the corporation shall indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the appropriate agency or agencies of the Federal Government against any loss or damage and against any liability whatsoever arising from any act of the corporation or any agent, licensee, servant, or employee of the corporation.

SEC. 5. Such agencies of the Department of Defense as the Secretary of Defense may designate are authorized to lend to the corporation such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, hospital furniture, ensigns, flags, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles (except battle flags) as may be spared without detriment to the public service, and under such conditions as they may prescribe: *Provided*, That such loan shall be returned by the 15th day of September 1954, and the corporation shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to any of such property, and no expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, replacement, or operation of such equipment. The corporation shall give a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 6. The Commissioners, the Architect of the Captiol, the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, and the corporation are authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, radio-broadcasting, and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of any parade as shall be deemed convenient for use in connection with such parade and other convention purposes. Such wires shall be removed within 10 days after the conclusion of the convention.

SEC. 7. The regulations and licenses authorized by this act shall be in full force and effect only during the period August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive. Such regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulation shall be enforced until 5 days after such publication. Any person violating any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days. Each and every day a violation of any such regulation exists shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty prescribed herein shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

The joint resolution 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.

THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 561) to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in activities related to the American Legion national convention of 1954, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of General Services and the respective heads of executive departments and establishments may allocate such space in any public building under their care and supervision as they deem necessary for the purpose of quartering, for a period not exceeding 5 days beginning not earlier than the 29th day of August in the year 1954, troops participating in activities related to the American Legion national convention of 1954: *Provided*, That with respect to troops other than military units of the United States, the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation of the District of Columbia shall indemnify and save harmless the Federal Government, its executive departments and establishments from any loss or damage or from any liability whatsoever arising from the use of such space in such buildings.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike all after the colon and insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Department of Defense shall reimburse the executive agency responsible for care and supervision of the building for any damage thereto done by such troops, and such reimbursement may be credited to the appropriation or fund available for repair and maintenance of the building."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution 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.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3683) to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act is hereby amended by striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Credit unions established under this act shall be under the supervision of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. They shall make such financial reports to him (at least annually) as he may require.

"(b) Not later than January 31 of each calendar year each credit union established under this act shall pay to the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, for the preceding calendar year, a supervision fee in accordance with the scale prescribed for Federal credit unions. All such fees shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for the account of the Bureau in the special fund created by section 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act and may be expended by the Director for such administrative and other expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions hereof as he may determine to be proper, the purpose of such fees being to defray, as far as practical, the administrative and supervisory costs of the Bureau incident to the execution of its functions under this act.

"(c) Each credit union established under this act shall be subject to examination by, and for this purpose shall make its books and records accessible to, any person designated by the Director. The scale of examination fees prescribed for Federal credit unions shall also be applicable to credit unions established under this act which fees shall be assessed against and paid by each credit union established under this act promptly after the completion of such examination. Examination fees collected under the provisions of this section shall be deposited to the credit of the special fund created by section 5 of the Federal Credit Union Act, and shall be available for the purposes specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any credit union established under this act to transact business in the District of Columbia without procuring a license from the District of Columbia; and all such credit unions shall pay a license tax of $5 per annum to the District of Columbia. No license shall be granted for a longer period than 1 year: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may suspend or revoke a license upon proof of the bankruptcy or insolvency of any such credit union or upon conviction of a violation of any provision of this act or any law or regulation of the District of Columbia or of the United States."

SEC. 3. Section 12 of such act is hereby amended by striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 1, after "subsection", strike "(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

The committee amendment was 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.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3329) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of chief of police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of chief of police be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 2. Section 102 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 202 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 201 of this act in the grade or rank of fire chief shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of fire chief be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 4. Section 202 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 5. The provisions of this amending act shall become effective as of July 1, 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of Chief of Police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below

that of Chief of Police be increased by more than five longevity increases'.

"SEC. 2. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"'(1) $390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"'(2) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance;

"'(3) $390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"'(4) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a chief photographer.'

"SEC. 3. Section 202 (b) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In computing service in the grade of inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector'.

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of its enactment, except that the amendment made by section 2 shall take effect on July 1, 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.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1585) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the bill that we did not have a quorum to report the bill to the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to withdraw the bill?

Mr. KEARNS. I withdraw the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ASSESSMENT OF REAL ESTATE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7128) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," 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 2, strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive, and insert:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint as a permanent board of assistant assessors such persons as are conversant with real estate values in the District of Columbia and who have been bona fide residents of the District for a period of at least 5 years, except that 2 of such appointees may be persons who have been bona fide residents of the District of Columbia metropolitan area for a period of at least 5 years"."

Page 2, after line 19, insert:

"SEC. 2. Where any provision of this act, or any amendment made by this act, refers to an office or agency abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, such reference shall be deemed to be to the office, agency, or officer designated by the Commissioners to perform the functions of the office or agency so abolished."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3518) to amend the laws relating to fees charged for services rendered by the Office of the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia, and the laws relating to appointment of personnel in such office, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 552 of subchapter 4 of chapter 16 of the act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (sec. 45–708, D. C. Code, 1951 edition); section 12 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended and supplemented by the act approved June 19, 1948 (secs. 45–712 and 45–712a, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), or any other act of Congress, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, from time to time, increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged for filing, recording, and indexing or for making a certified copy of any instrument; for searching for records; for taking acknowledgments; for recording plats; for filing affidavits; for filing certificates of incorporation and amendments of certificates; for recording liens, assignments of liens, or releases of liens on motor vehicles or trailers; or for any other service rendered by the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(b) The fees for services rendered by the office of the Recorder of Deeds shall be fixed at such rates, computed on such bases and in such manner as may be in the judgment of the Commissioners, be necessary to defray the approximate cost of operating the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Commissioners to modify any provision of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, approved June 8, 1954.

SEC. 2. Section 548 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, as amended by the act approved June 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 129; sec. 45–701, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "All of the duties and functions of the Recorder of Deeds and of officers and employees in his office shall be performed subject to the supervision and control of the Commissioners of the District."

SEC. 3. Section 549 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, as amended by the act approved June 9, 1952 (sec. 45–702, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "The Recorder of Deeds is authorized to appoint a deputy recorder" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to appoint a deputy recorder of deeds."

SEC. 4. (a) So much of the first sentence of the act approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1102, ch. 416), as amended by the act approved June 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 129); sec. 45–703, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), as read: "That the Recorder of Deeds is authorized to appoint a second deputy recorder" is amended to read "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to appoint a second deputy recorder of deeds."

(b) The third sentence of such act approved March 3, 1925, as amended by such act approved June 9, 1952, is amended to read: "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint all employees in the office of the Recorder of Deeds, except the Recorder, in accordance with civil-service laws and fix the compensation of all employees in such office in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the said Commissioners may delegate to any officer subordinate to them the function of appointing any of the employees in such office other than the Recorder."

SEC. 5. Clause (p) of section 2 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (68 Stat. 180) is amended by adding thereto the following sentence: "It shall be the duty of the Recorder of Deeds and of any other officer or agency of the Government of the District of Columbia to perform any function delegated to such officer or agency by the Commissioners pursuant to this act."

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.

ARREST BOOKS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE OPEN TO PUBLIC INSPECTION

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3655) to provide that the Metropolitan Police force shall keep arrest books which are open to public inspection, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, may I say in connection with this bill that just a few minutes before the House convened at noon, I was handed a proposed amendment to the bill from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee has had no opportunity to consider this amendment and, therefore, I do not feel that I can in good faith offer it at this time. However, I do want to say in view of the action on this bill by the other

body, and the action heretofore taken by our committee, this proposed amendment should receive further consideration after the first of the year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the bill at this time on the ground that a quorum was not present in the committee when the bill was reported out.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the bill.

FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9882) to incorporate the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named persons, Justin Miller, California; William L. Ellis, Michigan; Betting Stalling, Illinois; William S. Tyson, North Carolina; Kennedy C. Watkins, District of Columbia; Martin C. Epstein, New York; Laurence H. Axman, District of Columbia; Julian R. Eagle, Pennsylvania; William F. Farrell, Texas; Barratt O'Hara, Jr., Illinois; Joseph F. Brodie, California; Spurgeon E. Paul, Colorado; J. Edward Hauk, Maryland; Ida I. Kloze, Maryland; William R. Vallance, New York; Clyde Baggarly, Virginia; Charles W. Freeman, California; William A. Roberts, District of Columbia; Ralph G. Cornell, Maryland; Horace Russell, Illinois;

Robert E. Freer, Ohio; Frank J. Delany, Illinois; William N. Morell, Minnesota; Heber H. Rice, Maryland; William E. Reese, Virginia; Robert N. Anderson, Virginia; Marguerite Rawalt, Texas; Robert H. Shields, Maryland; Harold Lee, New York; James E. Palmer, Jr., Virginia; John A. McIntire, Maryland; Maj. Gen. E. M. Brannon, District of Columbia; Maxwell H. Elliott, New York; Edwin L. Fisher, Maryland; Edward E. Odom, California; Rear Adm. Ira H. Nunn, Arkansas; Herman Phleger, California; Arthur J. Klayman, Illinois; F. Joseph Donohue, District of Columbia; Frank J. Parker, New York; Ernest Votaw, Pennsylvania; T. Wade Harrison, Florida; Adm. O. S. Colclough, Pennsylvania; J. Lee Rankin, Nebraska; Stanley N. Barnes, California; Newell Blair, Virginia;

Clarence A. Davis, Nebraska; Ralph E. Becker, New York; George J. Bott, Maryland; John C. Doerfer, Wisconsin; Richard S. Doyle, Maryland; Whitney Gilliland, Iowa; Abe McGregor Goff, Idaho; Earl W. Kintner, Indiana; J. Hervey Macomber, Vermont; William P. McCracken, District of Columbia; Andrew P. Murphy, Jr., Massachusetts; Lambert McAllister, Ohio; Joe E. Moody, Missouri; Lawrence C. Moore, District of Columbia; Perry Morton, Nebraska; Emory T. Nunneley, Pennsylvania; William Simon, District of Columbia; Conrad Snow, New Hampshire; William H. Timbers, Connecticut; F. Trowbridge vomBaur, District of Columbia; Frank H. Weitzel, District of Columbia; Curtis C. Williams, Ohio; Emory J. Woodall, Virginia; Wendell Barnes, Oklahoma; Roger S. Foster, District of Columbia; Calver Magruder, Massachusetts;

George C. Sweeney, Massachusetts; John C. Knox, New York; Edward J. Dimock, New York; David N. Edelstein, New York; Clarence G. Galston, New York; John Knight, New York; John J. Parker, North Carolina; Armistead M. Dobie, Virginia; Harry E. Watkins, West Virginia; Joseph C. Hutcheson, Virginia; Thomas F. McAllister, Michigan; F. Ryan Duffy, Wisconsin; John Caskie Collet, Missouri; John Sanborn, Minnesota; Robert C. Bell, Minnesota; William Denman, California; Albert Lee Stephens, California; Alfred P. Murrah, Oklahoma; George Thomas Washington, District of Columbia; Charles Fahy, District of Columbia; Bolitha J. Laws, District of Columbia; F. Dickinson Letts, District of Columbia; Luther W. Youngdahl, District of Columbia; William P. Cole, Jr., District of Columbia; Paul D. Shriver, Guam; Dennis F. Donovan, Minnesota;

Alfred C. Clapp, New Jersey; L. Dale Coffman, California; John T. Fey, District of Columbia; Jefferson B. Fordham, Pennsylvania; Erwin N. Griswold, Massachusetts; Albert J. Harno, Illinois; L. A. Haslup, Florida; Harold C. Havighurst, Illinois; Paul M. Hebert, Louisiana; Elwood H. Hettrick, Massachusetts; Jacob D. Hyman, New York; Schuyler W. Jackson, Kansas; George M. Johnson, District of Columbia; Gordon Johnston, Colorado; Charles H. King, Michigan; Robert Kingsley, California; Arthur Larson, Pennsylvania; J. A. McClain, Jr., North Carolina; Glenn A. McCleary, Missouri; F. J. Moreau, Kansas; William T. Muse, Virginia; Russell D. Niles, New York; Maynard E. Pirsig, Minnesota; F. D. G. Ribble, Virginia; John Ritchie, Wisconsin; David E. Snodgress, California;

Carl Spaeth, California; Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Kentucky; Robert S. Stevens, New York; Wesley Sturges, Connecticut; Harry D. Taft, Illinois; Rev. Joseph T. Tinnelly, New York; Martin Tollefson, Iowa; Leon H. Wallace, Indiana; Clayton E. Williams, Virginia; Roscoe L. Barrow, Ohio; Henry P. Brandis, Jr., Colorado; A. L. Gausewitz, New Mexico; Spencer L. Kimball, Utah; C. W. Leaphart, Montana; Daniel J. McKenna, Michigan; Joseph O'Meara, Indiana; R. A. Rasco, Florida; Seward Reese, Oregon; Earl Sneed, Jr., Oklahoma; Brendan F. Brown, District of Columbia; O. H. Thormodsgard, North Dakota; Ray Forrester, Louisiana; are hereby created a body corporate, of the District of Columbia and there domiciled, by the name of "The Foundation of the Federal Bar Association" (hereafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the adoption, amendment, and revision of bylaws, not inconsistent with this charter, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are as follows:

(1) To receive and hold by bequest, devise, gift, grant, purchase, lease, or otherwise, either absolutely or jointly with any other person or persons or corporation, for any of the purposes hereinafter set forth, any property, real, personal, or mixed, or any undivided interest therein; to convey, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property, and to invest, reinvest, administer, and deal with the same in such manner as in the judgment of the directors of the corporation will best promote the purposes of the corporation, but without and free from restrictions applicable to trustees or trust funds,

(2) To apply its income, and if the corporation so decides, all or any part of its principal, exclusively to the following educational, charitable, scientific, or literary purposes, or any of them:

(a) To advance the science of jurisprudence;

(b) To uphold high standards for the Federal judiciary and for attorneys representing the Government of the United States;

(c) To promote and improve the administration of justice, including the study of means for the improved handling of the legal business of the several Federal departments and establishments;

(d) To facilitate the cultivation and diffusion of knowledge and understanding of the law and the promotion of the study of the law and the science of jurisprudence and research therein, through the maintenance of a law library, the establishment of seminars, lectures, and studies devoted to the law, and the publication of addresses, essays, treatises, reports, and other literary works by students, practitioners, and teachers of the law; and

(e) To provide for the acquisition, preservation, and exhibition of rare books and documents, sculptures, paintings, and other objects of art and historical interest relating to the law, the courts, and the legal profession,

(3) To do any and all things necessary or incident to the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have the following powers:

(a) To sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal.

(c) To choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require.

(d) To adopt, amend, apply, and administer bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs.

(e) To contract and be contracted with.

(f) To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, bequest, or otherwise, any property, real or personal, or mixed, necessary for carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law of any State (1) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (2) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State.

(g) To transfer, lease, or convey real or personal property.

(h) To borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, and issue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage or pledge subject to applicable Federal or State laws.

(i) To do any and all acts necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; RESIDENT AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia and may conduct its activities at any place or places in the United States, or elsewhere.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice served upon such agent, or mailed to such agent at such business address, shall be deemed service upon or notice to the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. (a) The membership of the corporation consists of the persons listed in the first section of this act, the persons who hereafter become members of the National Council of the Federal Bar Association, a nonprofit corporation of the District of Columbia (for the duration of their membership as such), and such others as the corporation may provide for by bylaw or otherwise.

(b) Each member of the corporation may cast one vote on each matter submitted to a vote of the members.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. (a) The governing body of the corporation is its board of directors, which during the calendar year of this enactment, will comprise the following:

Bettin Stalling, of Illinois;
Stanley N. Barnes, of California;
Clarence A. Davis, of Nebraska;
Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana;
Lawrence H. Axman, District of Columbia;
Wendell Barnes, of Oklahoma;
William L. Ellis, of Michigan; and
Arthur J. Klayman, of Illinois,

who are currently members of the executive committee of the Federal Bar Association.

(b) Thereafter the board of directors will consist of 12 persons elected, and subject to removal at any time, by majority vote of the members of the corporation. The term of office of the elected members of the board is for 6 years, except that, for the first elected board, four shall be elected for a term of 2 years, 4 for a term of 4 years, and 4 for a term of 6 years. Vacancies in the board of directors, caused by expiration of the members' terms or otherwise, shall be filled by a majority vote of the members of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors may exercise, or provide for the exercise of, the powers herein granted to the corporation, and each member of the board shall have one vote upon all matters determined. The board shall meet at least annually. The board may delegate its powers to a prudential committee subject to the direction of, and reporting to, the board. The president of the corporation shall act as chairman of the board and of the committee.

OFFICERS

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall consist of a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, historian, and such other officers as may be determined by bylaw.

The officers shall have such powers, consistent with this charter, as may be provided by bylaw.

(b) The officers shall be elected by the board of directors at its initial meeting and thereafter at its annual designated meeting and shall serve for a term of 1 year.

LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the net earnings of the corporation shall inure to the benefit of any member, officer, director, or private individual, nor shall any member or private individual be liable for the obligations of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loans to its officers or members of the board of directors. Any officer or director who votes for, assents to, or participates in the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until its repayment.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. (a) None of the activities, funds, property, or income of the corporation shall be used in carrying on any political activity, directly or indirectly, or in attempting to influence legislation.

(b) Neither the corporation nor its officers or directors shall, as such, contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall not issue any shares of stock nor declare or pay dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account. It shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its membership and of the board of directors or committees having any of the authority of the board of directors. It shall also keep at its principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members, directors, and officers. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of the audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress within 6 months after the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

DISSOLUTION

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

SEC. 16. No person who is a member of, or who advocates the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become, or continue to be, a member, director, or officer of the corporation.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME

SEC. 17. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, "The Foundation of the Federal Bar Association."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 18. As used in this act, the word "State" includes the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 19. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved to the Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4 line 12, strike out "Snodgress" and insert in lieu thereof "Snodgrass."

On page 14, line 1, strike the word "AMENDMENT" and insert the following "RESERVATION OF THE RIGHT TO AMEND AND REPEAL CHARTER."

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.

REFERRAL OF CASES BY DISTRICT MUNICIPAL COURT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX COURT

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7670) relating to the referral of cases by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Tax Court, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended by the act of May 6, 1938, the act of July 26, 1939, and the act of July 10, 1952, is further amended by adding thereto a new section, 15, as follows:

"SEC. 15. (a) Any cause in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia involving any tax or taxes assessed by any taxing authority of the District of Columbia may, upon the order of the Chief Judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, be referred to the District of Columbia Tax Court. The District of Columbia Tax Court shall hear and determine all questions arising in said cause and shall render its decision thereon in writing. All orders, judgments, and decisions rendered in said cause after such referral shall be considered as orders, judgments, and decisions, respectively, of the District of Columbia Tax Court, and shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit as provided in section 4 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended.

"(b) Any civil cause, not involving taxation, pending in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia may, upon the order of the Chief Judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia and the approval of the Judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court, be referred to the District of Columbia Tax Court, which shall promptly hear such cause and render judgment as justice may require. In respect of such cause and all proceedings, thereon, after such referral, the Judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court shall be considered a Judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and any order, judgment, or decision entered therein shall be considered an order, judgment, or decision, respectively, of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia."

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.

AMENDING TITLE IX OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8590) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added to by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended by the act of July 10, 1952, and as added to and as amended is amended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof the words "for term of 4 years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "for the term of 10 years"; and is further

amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"The judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court may hereafter retire—

"(1) after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 20 years or more, whether continuously or not;

"(2) after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 10 years or more, whether continuously or not, and having attained the age of 70 years; or

"(3) after having become permanently disabled from performing his duties, regardless of age or length of service.

Such judge may retire for disability by furnishing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The judge who retires under this section shall receive annually in monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the time of such retirement as a total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of 30 years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge. In no event shall the sum received by such judge hereunder be in excess of the salary of such judge at the time of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in the Board of Tax Appeals of the District of Columbia, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous.

"(a) the Term 'retire' as used in this section shall mean and include retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of incumbent.

"(b) Any judge receiving retirement salary other than for disability under the provisions of this section may be called upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in said court, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for more than 90 days in any calendar year after such retirement. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such retired judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability."

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.

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8915) to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942 (ch. 207, 56 Stat. 190; sec. 11–772, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), be, and it is hereby, amended by adding to section 7 of said act the following new paragraphs:

"(e) The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is hereby vested with exclusive jurisdiction to review, in the manner hereinafter provided, the following orders or decisions of administrative agencies of the District of Columbia—

"(1) any decision of the Board of Pharmacy refusing to renew a license to practice pharmacy or refusing to renew a permit to deal in poisons for use in the arts or as insecticides under the provisions of the act of May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 177), as amended (sec. 2–606, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(2) any decision of the Board of Examiners in Veterinary Medicine revoking or suspending a license to practice veterinary medicine or any branch thereof under the provisions of the act of February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 873; sec. 2–810, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(3) any order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their agent or a decision of the Commissioners revoking or suspending a motor-vehicle operator's permit under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1925 (ch. 443, 43 Stat. 1121, as amended (sec. 40–302, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(4) any decision of the Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects annulling or revoking a certificate to practice architecture under the provisions of the act of December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 717), as amended (sec. 2–1028, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(5) any order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, revoking, or suspending a license for a private employment agency under the provisions of the act of July 1, 1932 (ch. 366, 47 Stat. 559; sec. 47–2101, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(6) any decision of the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia denying a license or a registration to practice the healing art under the provisions of the act of February 27, 1929 (ch. 352, 45 Stat. 1338; sec. 2–129, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(7) any decision of the Nurses' Examining Board denying registration or reregistration of a nurse or school of nursing under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1929 (ch. 540, 45 Stat. 1521; sec. 2–406, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(8) any decision of the Board of Barber Examiners refusing to issue, renew, restore, or revoking a certificate of registration as a registered barber or barber apprentice under the provisions of the act of June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 622; sec. 2–1110, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

"(9) any final decision of the Real Estate Commission of the District of Columbia denying an application for license or suspending or revoking a license under the provisions of the act of August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 788; secs. 45–1403 to 1418, D. C. Code, 1951 edition); or

"(10) any final decision of the District of Columbia Tax Court created under the act of Congress August 17, 1937 (ch. 690, 52 Stat. 371), as amended (secs. 47–2401 to 2412, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by any such decision or order may obtain a review thereof by filing in the municipal court of appeals a written petition for review praying that the decision or order be set aside. The court may by rule prescribe the form and contents of the petition and regulate generally all matters relating to proceedings on such appeals. The petition for review shall be filed in said court within such time as said court may by rule prescribe and a copy of such petition shall forthwith be served by mail by the clerk of the court upon the agency affected thereby. Within such time as may be fixed by rule of the court such agency shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding and the clerk of the court shall immediately notify the petitioner of the filing thereof. Upon the filing of the record the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the decision or order complained of, in whole or in part, and, if need be, to remand the case for further proceedings, as justice may require: *Provided, however*, That no application for review or pendency of an appeal shall operate as a stay of the operation of any such decision or order in any case where, under existing law, a stay may not be granted, nor shall such application operate as a stay in any other case unless so ordered by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or by said court for good cause shown; and for good cause shown and upon such conditions as may be required and to the extent necessary to prevent irreparable injury, the court is authorized to take appropriate and necessary action to preserve the status or rights pending conclusion of the review proceedings; that all appeals shall be heard and determined upon the record of proceedings before the appropriate board or agency to be certified to this court in accordance with such rules or instructions as the court may from time to time prescribe, and the review of all decisions or orders by said court shall be limited to such issues of law or fact as are subject to review on appeal under the applicable provisions of existing law, or, if there be no statutory limitation, by such rules of law as define the scope and limitations of review of administrative proceedings, and which rules, by way of elaboration and not limitation, shall include the power of the court—

"(1) so far as necessary to decision and where presented to decide all relevant questions of law, to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and to determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any agency action; and

"(2) to hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings and conclusions found to be (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with law; (B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory right; (D) without observance of procedure required by law; (E) unsupported by substantial evidence or facts in the record of the proceedings before the court, or (F) unwarranted by the facts.

In making the foregoing determinations, due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error."

SEC. 2. This act shall apply only to decisions or orders of the above enumerated agencies rendered or entered on or after the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 23, strike the word "revoking" and insert in lieu thereof "denying, revoking."

On page 4, line 5, insert "and" at the end of the line.

On page 4, line 11, strike the semicolon and the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 4, strike lines 12, 13, 14 and 15.

On page 5, lines 2 and 3, strike "a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding" and insert in lieu thereof "the original papers comprising the record or any supplementary record or in the discretion of the agency, certified copies of such papers."

On page 5, line 5, strike the word "record" and insert in lieu thereof "petition for review."

Page 6, line 23, insert the following sentence before the quotation mark: "Any party aggrieved by any judgment of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of the act approved April 1, 1942 (sec. 11–773, D. C. Code, 1951 edition)."

The 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.

AMENDING SECTION 1089 OF THE CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RELATING TO ATTACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8128) to modify the requirement for an oath in certain cases in attachment proceedings in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1089 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 15–304), is amended by striking out "under oath" and inserting in lieu thereof "verified by a written declaration that said answer is made under the penalties of perjury."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1089 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 15–304), is amended (a) by striking out 'file his answers, under oath' and inserting in lieu thereof 'file his answers verified by a written declaration that such answers are made under the penalties of perjury'; (b) by inserting '(a)' after '1809', and (c) by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"'(b) Only one attachment upon goods, chattels, and credits of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time. Where more than one such attachment issued against the same judgment debtor has been served on any garnishee such attachments shall be satisfied in the order in which they were served upon the garnishee.

"'(c) Every person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, pursuant to this section, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury.'"

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman explain this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide that in cases of attachments or garnishments in the District of Columbia the answers to interrogatories may be verified by a written declaration made under the penalties of perjury rather than make such statements under oath, as now required by existing law.

The bill also provides that only one attachment upon the goods, chattels, and credits of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time.

This is simply an act to save persons who have to make returns the difficulty and expense of having a notary take acknowledgments but provides for a penalty of perjury if a false statement is made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The 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 to read: "A bill to amend section 1089 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to attachment proceedings."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO MAKE DETERMINATION IN PROPER CASES FOR THE PROSECUTION OF CERTAIN JUVENILES SHALL BE TRIED IN JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7484) to authorize the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to make the determination in proper cases whether prosecution of certain juveniles, charged with capital offenses, those punishable by life imprisonment, and other felonies, shall be tried in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 599), as heretofore amended by the act of May 15, 1947 (61 Stat. 92; 11 D. C. Code 914), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by striking existing section 13 and adding the following:

"SEC. 13. (a) If a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult, or any child is charged with an offense which if committed by an adult is punishable by death or life imprisonment, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia shall, notwithstanding any provisions of law inconsistent herewith, after full investigation including consideration of police records and the records and reports of the juvenile court which shall be made available to him, determine whether it is necessary in the public interest that the child shall be held for trial under the regular procedure of the United States district court which would have jurisdiction over such offense if committed by an adult.

"(b) In making his determination as to the public interest in the aforementioned category, of cases, the United States attorney shall take into consideration the following factors: the age of the child the family background of the child whether the felony with which the child is charged is characterized by aggravated circumstances whether the child has been involved in any previous violations of the law; whether such previous violations of law, if any, are serious; whether upon consideration of the family background of the child there appears a likelihood of rehabilitation under parental supervision; or whether previous efforts, if any, by the juvenile court authorities toward rehabilitation of the child have met with success. After careful consideration of these factors or such of them as may be applicable, the United States attorney is hereby authorized in his discretion to make the determination that it is in the public interest that the child shall be held and tried under the legal procedure of the United States district court which would have jurisdiction over such offense or offenses if committed by an adult. The determination of the United States attorney as to the matters herein authorized shall be final and not subject to court review.

"(c) The judgment of the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that it is necessary in the public interest that the child be held for trial under the regular procedure of the United States district court shall be confirmed in a written communication over the signature of the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, addressed to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and shall be made a part of the record of the case or proceeding. A copy of said confirmation shall be addressed to the juvenile court of the District of Columbia and to the United States branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

"(d) In the event the United States attorney for the District of Columbia decides that the facts and circumstances of the case justify reference to the juvenile court, he shall certify the case in writing to that court."

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.

BOARD OF CONDEMNATION OF INSANITARY BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6127) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906 (34 Stat. 157; sec. 5–601, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is amended (a) by striking so much as reads "That there be, and is hereby, created in and for the District of Columbia a Board to be known as the", and inserting in lieu thereof "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to

establish a"; (b) by striking so much as reads "to consist of the assistant to the Engineer Commissioner in charge of buildings, the health officer, and the inspector of buildings of said District, and to", and inserting in lieu thereof "consisting of one or more members, together with one or more alternates for each member, which Board shall"; (c) by striking the word "vacated" and the commas immediately preceding and following the word "demolished"; and (d) by striking the fourth and fifth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "Nothing herein contained shall be construed as preventing the Commissioners, in their discretion, from changing the membership of said Board from time to time, and from discontinuing, abolishing, or reestablishing the same, as they from time to time may determine."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act (34 Stat. 157; sec. 5-602, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Each member or alternate member of said Board who is not an employee of the government of the District of Columbia or the Government of the United States shall be entitled to a per diem of $25 for each day such member or alternate member is actually engaged in discharging his duties pursuant to this act. No member or alternate member of said Board shall have any property interests in the building the sanitary condition of which is under consideration."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act, as amended (56 Stat. 1054); sec. 5-603, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (a) by inserting the designation "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof; (b) by striking "and through inquiry" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "or through inquiry"; (c) by striking so much of the second sentence as reads "each owner or part owner" and inserting in lieu thereof "the owner"; (d) by striking the words "or part owner" in the fourth sentence; (e) by amending the fifth sentence to read "If, within the time to show cause fixed by the Board, or at such hearing, if the same be requested, the owner shall fail to show cause sufficient in the opinion of said Board to prevent the condemnation of such building or part building, said Board shall issue an order condemning such building or part of building, and ordering same to be put into sanitary condition or to be demolished and removed, within a time to be fixed by the Board, and shall cause a copy of such order to be served on the owner thereof, and a copy to be affixed to the building or part of building condemned,"; (f) by adding at the end of said subsection "(a)", as so designated by this section, the following: "The time to be fixed by the Board, during which the building shall be put in sanitary condition or be demolished and removed, shall not be less than 30 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after the date of service of said order, unless the Board shall find that the condition of said premises is such as to cause immediate danger to the health or lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, in which event the Board may fix a lesser time."; and (g) by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) The several provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved April 16, 1932 (47 Stat. 86; sec. 4-601 to 4-603, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), shall be applicable to and enforceable in any proceeding by the said Board. Each member of said Board, and each alternate member when acting in the stead of the member for whom he is alternate, is hereby authorized to administer oaths to witnesses summoned in any proceeding conducted by said Board. Any fee which may be paid any witness summoned to appear before said Board shall be assessed as a tax against the property the condition of which is under investigation by said Board, such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such act, as amended (56 Stat. 1055; sec. 5-605, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 5"; (b) striking so much as reads "or, if there be several part owners of such building, from the latest date of service on any part owner;"; (c) by striking so much as reads "any owner or the latest date of service on any part owner" and inserting in lieu thereof "such owner"; and (d) by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(b) The owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act shall, within the time specified by said Board in the order of condemnation, or any extension of such time which may be granted by said Board, (1) make such changes or repairs as will remedy in a manner satisfactory to said Board the conditions which led to the condemnation of such building or part of building, or (2) cause such building or part of building to be demolished and removed."

SEC. 5. Section 7 of said act, as amended (56 Stat. 1055; sec. 5-607, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. If the owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act shall fail to remedy in a manner satisfactory to said Board the condition or conditions which led to the condemnation thereof, by causing the same to be put into sanitary condition or to be demolished and removed within the time specified by said Board in the order of condemnation or any extension thereof which may be granted by said Board, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to the penalties provided by section 13 of this act, as amended, and such building or part of building may be put into sanitary condition or be demolished and removed under the direction of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and the cost of such repairs or such demolition and removal, including the cost of making good damage to adjoining premises (except such as may have resulted from carelessness or willful recklessness in the demolition or removal of such building), and the cost of publication, if any, herein provided for, less the amount, if any, received from the sale of the old material, shall be assessed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as a tax against the premises on which such building or part of building was situated, such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That no building shall be demolished and removed under the direction of said Board until the Commissioners have considered the necessity for such demolition and removal and have approved the same."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 10 of such act, as amended (34 Stat. 159; sec. 5-610, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by striking therefrom "if published on 10 consecutive days" and inserting in lieu thereof "if published on 3 consecutive days."

SEC. 7. Such act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 17. (a) For the purpose of this act, the term 'owner' shall mean (1) any person, or any one of a number of persons, in whom is vested all or any part of the beneficial ownership, dominion, or title of the property found by the board to be in an insanitary condition; (2) the committee, conservator, or legal guarian of an owner who is non compos mentis, a minor child, or otherwise under a disability; (3) a trustee elected or appointed, or required by law, to execute a trust, other than a trustee under a deed of trust to secure the repayment of a loan.

"(b) Wherever under this act any act is to be performed by, or any notice is to be given, an owner, such act may be performed by, or such notice may be given, an agent of such owner."

SEC. 8. The Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia created by the first section of the act approved May 1, 1906 (34 Stat. 157; sec. 5-601, D. C. Code, 1951 ed), is amended, is hereby abolished, but all actions taken by, and all suits and proceedings instituted by or against, the said Board created by the said act of May 1, 1906, prior to the effective date of this amendatory act, shall be deemed to have been taken by, or instituted by or against, the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia as the same may be established by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the authority of this amending act.

(b) Wherever in the act approved May 1, 1906, as amended, reference is made to "Board," "Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Building," or "Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia," such term shall mean the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia established by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to the authority contained in this amending act.

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect 10 days after its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the act entitled 'An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 1, 1906 (34 Stat. 157; title 5, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to examine into the sanitary condition of all buildings in said District, to condemn those buildings which are in such insanitary condition as to endanger the health or lives of the occupants thereof or persons living in the vicinity, and to cause all buildings to be put into sanitary condition or to be demolished and removed, as may be required by the provisions of this act. The Commissioners may authorize and direct the performance of the duties imposed on them by this act by such officers, agents, employees, contractors, employees of contractors, and other persons as may be designated, detailed, employed, or appointed by the said Commissioners to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commissioners or their designated agent or agents are authorized to investigate, through personal inquiry and inspection, into the sanitary condition of any building or part of a building in said District, except such as are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. The Commissioners, and all persons acting under their authority and the authority contained in this act, may, between the hours of 8 o'clock antemeridian and 5 o'clock postmeridian, peaceably enter into and upon any and all lands and buildings in said District for the purpose of inspecting the same.

" 'SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioners are directed to appoint or designate two separate boards, each to consist of not less than three members to perform the duties and functions required by this act, as follows:

" '(1) A Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings to examine into the sanitary condition of buildings in the District of Columbia, to determine which such buildings are in such insanitary condition as to endanger the lives or health of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, and to issue appropriate orders of condemnation requiring the correction of such condition or conditions or to require the demolition of any building, in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"'(2) A Condemnation Review Board, no member of which shall act as a member of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, to review, upon written request, any order of condemnation issued by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, and to affirm, modify, or vacate such order of condemnation if the Condemnation Review Board shall find that the sanitary conditions of the building under examination requires the affirmation, modification, or vacation of such order of condemnation. The Condemnation Review Board shall consist of at least three members and an alternate member for each of said members, at least two-thirds of such members and at least two-thirds of such alternate members to be residents of the District of Columbia and to be selected from among the persons designated under subsection (c) of this section, and not more than one-third of such members and one-third of such alternate members may be employed by the government of the District of Columbia.

"'(b) A majority of the members of each of the boards established by subsection (a) of this section shall constitute a quorum, and a majority vote of the members present shall be required in connection with any act of either of the said boards. No person shall act as a member of either of the said boards who has any property interest, direct or indirect, in his own right or through relatives or kin, in the building the sanitary condition of which is under consideration.

"'(c) The Commissioners shall designate a number of real property-owning residents of the District of Columbia, not employed by the government of the District of Columbia or the Government of the United States, each of whom from time to time shall be designated by the Commissioners to act as a member or an alternate member of the Condemnation Review Board established under the authority of subsection (a) of this section. Each such person shall be entitled to a fee of $25 for each day he is actually engaged in discharging his duties as a member of said Board, or as an alternate member acting in the place of a member.

"'(d) The several provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved April 16, 1932 (47 Stat. 86; secs. 4-601 to 4-603, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), shall be applicable to and enforceable in any proceeding conducted under the authority of this act. Each person acting as a member of either of the boards required to be established by this section, and each alternate member when acting in the stead of the member for whom he is alternate, is hereby authorized to administer oaths to witnesses summoned in any proceeding conducted by either of the said boards. Any fee which may be paid any witness summoned to appear before either of the said boards shall be assessed as a tax against the property the condition of which is under investigation, such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That whenever any order of condemnation is vacated or set aside, either by the Condemnation Review Board or by a court, the witness fee authorized by this subsection to be assessed against the property affected by such order of condemnation shall not be so assessed, but shall be paid by the government of the District of Columbia.

"'SEC. 3. Whenever the Board of the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings shall find that any building or part of building is in such insanitary condition as to endanger the health or lives of the occupants thereof or persons living in the vicinity, the owner of such building shall be served with a notice requiring him to show cause, within a time to be specified in such notice, why such building or part of building should not be condemned. The time to be fixed in such notice shall not be less than 10 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after the date of service of said notice, unless the Board shall find that the insanitary condition of such building or part of building is such as to cause immediate danger to the health or lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, in which case a lesser time may be specified in said notice. If within the time to show cause fixed by the Board the owner shall fail to show cause sufficient in the opinion of the Board to prevent the condemnation of such building or part of building, the Board shall issue an order condemning such building or part of building and ordering the same to be put into sanitary condition or to be demolished and removed within a time to be specified in said order of condemnation, and shall cause a copy of such order to be served on the owner and a copy to be affixed to the building or part of building condemned. The Board shall give the owner reasonable time within which to put the building in sanitary condition, but such time shall be not less than 6 months after the date of service of said order on said owner, unless the Board shall find that the condition of said premises is such as to cause immediate danger to the health or lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, in which event the Board may fix a lesser time. From and after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays or legal holidays, or within such additional time as may be fixed by the Board, after a copy of any order of condemnation has been affixed to any condemned building or part of building, no person shall occupy such building or part of building.

"'SEC. 4. No person having authority to prevent shall permit any building or part of building condemned to be occupied, except as specially authorized by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings under the authority contained in this act, after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, or within such additional time as may be fixed by the Board, from and after the date of service of a copy of the order of condemnation on the owner of such building; or, if a copy of such order of condemnation has been affixed to the condemned building or part of building at a date subsequent to the date of service of the notice on the owner, after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, or within such additional time as may be fixed by the Board, from the date on which said copy of such order of condemnation was so affixed.

"'SEC. 5. The owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act shall, within the time specified by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the order of condemnation, or any extension of time which may be granted by the Board, (1) make such changes or repairs as will remedy the conditions which led to the condemnation of such building or part of building, or (2) cause such building or part of building to be demolished and removed: *Provided*, That any owner repairing a building or part of building in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be required to make only those repairs which are reasonably related to a correction of the insanitary condition or conditions found by said Board to exist in or about said building, and nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the Board to require any repair not reasonably related to the correction of any insanitary condition in or about such building, or to require such building to be brought fully into conformity with the District of Columbia Building Code or other building regulations in effect at the time such repairs are made. Whenever any building is repaired or demolished in accordance with the requirements of this section, such repair or demolition shall be performed in such manner and under the authority of such permit as may be required by any applicable law or regulation.

"'SEC. 6. If the owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act shall make such changes or repairs as will remedy in a manner satisfactory to the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings the conditions which led to the condemnation of such building or part of building, the order of condemnation shall be canceled and the building may again be occupied. If the owner cannot make such changes or repairs within the period within which the owner may lawfully permit such building or part of building to be occupied under section 4 of this act, but proceeds with such changes or repairs with reasonable diligence during such period, said Board may, by special order, extend from time to time the period within which the occupants of said building or part of building may remain therein, and within which the owner of such building may permit the said occupants so to remain.

"'SEC. 7. If the owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act shall fail to remedy in a manner satisfactory to the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings the condition or conditions which led to the condemnation thereof, by failing to cause such building or part of building to be put into sanitary condition or to be demolished and removed within the time specified by said Board in the order of condemnation or any extension thereof, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be liable to the penalties provided by section 16 of this act, and such building or part of building may be put into sanitary condition or be demolished and removed under the direction of said Board, and the cost of such repairs or such demolition and removal, including the cost of making good damage to adjoining premises (except such as may have resulted from carelessness or willful recklessness in the demolition or removal of such building), and the cost of publication, if any, herein provided for, less the amount, if any, received from the sale of the old material, shall be assessed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as a tax against the premises on which such building or part of building was situated, such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the pendency of any review or appeal provided for by sections 13 and 14 of this act shall stay the operation of any order issued by said Board, unless said Board shall find that the condition of said premises is such as to cause immediate danger to the health or lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity.

"'SEC. 8. Whenever the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings is in doubt as to the ownership of any building or part of a building, the condemnation of which is contemplated, because the title thereto is in litigation, said Board may notify all parties to the suit and may report the circumstances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who may bring such circumstances to the attention of the court in which such litigation is pending for the purpose of securing such order or decree as will enable said Board to continue such condemnation proceedings, and such court is hereby authorized to make such decrees and orders in such pending suit as may be necessary for that purpose.

"'SEC. 9. Whenever the title to any building or part of building is vested in a person non compos mentis, or a minor child or minor children without legal guardian, the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings shall report that fact to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall take due legal steps to secure the appointment of a guardian or guardians for such person non compos mentis, or minor child or children aforesaid, for the purpose of the condemnation proceedings authorized by this act, and any judge of the

United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to appoint a guardian or guardians for such purpose.

"'SEC. 10. Any notice required by this act to be served shall be deemed to have been served if delivered to the person to be notified, or if left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified, with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident therein; or if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed therein at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or if no such office can be found in said District by reasonable search, if forwarded by registered mail to the last known address of the person to be notified and not returned by the post-office authorities; or if no address be known or can by reasonable diligence be ascertained, or if any notice forwarded as authorized by the preceding clause of this section be returned by the post-office authorities, if published on 3 consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, if served on the owner of record in the manner hereinbefore in this section provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right; and notice to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served if served on any agent of such corporation personally, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

"'SEC. 11. No person shall interfere with the Commissioners or with any person acting under authority and by direction of said Commissioners in the discharge of his lawful duties, nor hinder, prevent, or refuse to permit any lawful inspection or the performance of any work authorized by this act to be done by or by authority and direction of said Commissioners.

"'SEC. 12. No person shall, without the consent of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, deface, obliterate, remove, or conceal any copy of any order of condemnation which has been affixed to any building or part of building by order of the said Board; and the owner and the person having custody of any building or part of building to which a copy or copies of any such order has been affixed shall, if said copy of said order has been to his knowledge defaced, obliterated, or removed, forthwith report that fact in writing to the Board (unless he has good reason to believe that such copy of such an order has been removed by authority of the Board), and if such copy of such order has been concealed, he shall forthwith expose the same to view.

"'SEC. 13. Any owner of property affected by an order of condemnation issued under the authority contained in this act shall be entitled to a review of such order by the Condemnation Review Board established by the Commissioners in accordance with the provision of section 2 of this act, upon making application to said Condemnation Review Board, in writing, within 15 days from the date on which such owner has been served notice of such order of condemnation, and upon payment of a fee of $25. The said Condemnation Review Board shall be authorized by the Commissioners to affirm, modify, or vacate any order of condemnation issued under the authority contained in this act.

"'SEC. 14. The owner of any building or part of building condemned under the provisions of this act may, within 15 days from the date on which such owner receives notice that such order of condemnation has been reviewed by the Condemnation Review Board established in accordance with section 2 of this act and has been affirmed or modified by such Board, appeal to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for the modification or vacation of said order of condemnation. The municipal court shall give precedence to any such case, shall hear the testimony adduced therein, shall view the building or part of building affected by said order of condemnation, and thereafter shall affirm, modify, or vacate said order. In any proceeding instituted in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, such proceeding shall be conducted by the judge only, and nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing or entitling the owner of property affected by such order of condemnation to a trial by jury.

"'SEC. 15. Whenever any insanitary condition which has led to the condemnation of a building or part of building has been caused in any part by the action or by the neglect of the tenant or tenants, occupant or occupants thereof, such tenant, tenants, occupant, or occupants shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be liable to the penalties provided in section 16 of this act.

"'SEC. 16. Any person violating or aiding or abetting in violating sections 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, or 15 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, upon information filed in the name of said District, be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 90 days; and each day on which such unlawful act is done or during which such unlawful negligence continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

"'SEC. 17. Except as herein otherwise authorized all expenses, incident to the enforcement of this act shall be paid from appropriations made from time to time for that purpose in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

"'SEC. 18. (a) For the purposes of this act, the term "Commissioners" shall mean the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents; and the term "owner" shall mean (1) any person, or any one of a number of persons, in whom is vested all or any part of the beneficial ownership, dominion, or title of the property found by the Commissioners to be in an insanitary condition; (2) the committee, conservator, or legal guardian of an owner who is non compos mentis, a minor child, or otherwise under a disability; or (3) a trustee elected or appointed, or required by law, to execute a trust, other than a trustee under a deed of trust to secure the repayment of a loan.

"'(b) Wherever under this act any act is to be performed by, or any notice is to be given, an owner, such act may be performed by an agent of such owner, or such notice may be given to an agent of such owner who collects rent or otherwise acts as an agent for the owner in connection with said property.

"'SEC. 19. (a) All suits and proceedings instituted by or against the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia created by the first section of the act approved May 1, 1906, supra, or the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings established by the Commissioners under the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, prior to the effective date of this act, shall be deemed to have been taken by, or instituted by or against, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"'(b) With respect to any building or part of building condemned by either of the Boards aforesaid prior to the effective date of this act, and which building or part of building stands condemned as of the effective date of this act the 6-month period provided by section 3 of this act shall commence running from the effective date hereof.

"'(c) Wherever any provision of this act refers to any order of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, such provision shall mean the order of such Board, or, if such order be reviewed by the Condemnation Review Board, as such order has been affirmed or modified by the latter Board; and wherever this act establishes any time limit within which there shall be compliance with an order of the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, such time limit shall begin running from the date on which the owner of the property affected by said order receives notice thereof, or, if such order be reviewed by the Condemnation Review Board, from the date on which the owner of such property receives notice that such order has been affirmed or modified by the latter Board.

"'SEC. 20. This act shall take effect 30 days after its approval.'"

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain amendments to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota to the committee amendment:

On page 10, line 2, insert a comma after the word "members."

On page 23, line 21, insert the word "amendatory" before the word "act."

On page 24, lines 1, 2, and 3, insert the word "amendatory" before the word "act."

On page 24, line 4, strike the word "hereof" and insert in lieu thereof "of this amendatory act."

On page 24, lines 14 and 16, strike the word "receives" and insert in lieu thereof "is served with."

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

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.

AMENDING ACTS RELATING TO ALLEY DWELLINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3506) to repeal the act approved September 25, 1914, and to amend the act approved June 12, 1934, both relating to alley dwellings in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order against consideration of this bill at this time on the ground that a quorum was not present when the bill was reported out.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for consideration of the bill S. 3506.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (S. 3329) was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 3329) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of Chief of Police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Chief of Police be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 2. Section 102 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 202 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 201 of this act in the grade or rank of Fire Chief shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Fire Chief be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 4. Section 202 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 5. The provisions of this amending act shall become effective as of July 1, 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of Chief of Police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Chief of Police be increased by more than five longevity increases.'

"SEC. 2. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"'(1) $390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"'(2) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance;

"'(3) $390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"'(4) $208, while he is assigned to duty as chief photographer.'

"SEC. 3. Section 202 (b) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In computing service in the grade of inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector.'

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of its enactment, except that the amendment made by section 2 shall take effect on July 1, 1953."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS as a substitute for the committee amendment:

"That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of chief of police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of chief of police be increased by more than five longevity increases'.

"Sec. 2. Section 102 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"'(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective'.

"SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 202 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 201 of this act in the grade or rank of Fire Chief shall not be increased by more than 4 longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Fire Chief be increased by more than 5 longevity increases.'

"SEC. 4. Section 202 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"'(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective.'

"SEC. 5. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"'(1) $390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"'(2) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator of a Fire Department hose wagon, aerial-ladder truck, rescue squad, or Fire Department ambulance;

"'(3) $390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"'(4) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a chief photographer.'

"SEC. 6. Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, shall take effect as of July 1, 1953, and section 5 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of the enactment of this act."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will explain this in order to throw a little more light on why this substitute was added?

Mr. KEARNS. May I inform the gentleman that when the bill was considered in committee at its last meeting we had overlooked the longevity privileges of 14 firemen who had not had longevity made retroactive to January 1, 1953. There is also one corporal on the police department who was eligible.

Furthermore, on the longevity matter, we found that the police officers who received longevity were the Chief of Police who only received four, which was correct, because he receives a greater salary than the other officers.

This is merely perfecting language to language that was not submitted in the original act or was not clarified in the original act.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

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. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that completes the bills on the District of Columbia Calendar.

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION, AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. DONDERO. 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. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

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. 9859, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9859, generally referred to as the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, comes to the floor of the House after a long series of hearings by our subcommittees and the hearings held by the full Committee on Public Works.

This bill adopts 85 river and harbor projects, located in 29 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, with a total estimated cost of $212,915,100.

It also adopts 22 beach-erosion projects, located in 12 States and the Territory of Hawaii, with a total estimated cost of $14,003,664.

It also adopts 33 flood-control projects with a total estimated cost of $294,852,750 and authorizes the modification of 8 projects heretofore approved by Congress.

The 8 authorizations for previously approved projects, including $20 million for watershed work being prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture, amount to $368,500,000.

The 140 projects in the bill are located in 41 of the 48 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if any of those projects are in the State of West Virginia?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not able to answer that offhand, but I will answer the gentleman before the debate is over.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman that there were seven projects authorized in the district that I represent. Back in 1946 we started work on the Sutton Reservoir, and when the Korean trouble came on, that was dropped. The other 6 are still there. Nothing has been done about them despite the fact that they have been authorized since 1938.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, if they have been authorized, then they are beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works of the House and are a subject for the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that I used the proper term in saying "authorizations." They were authorized by the Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Then it is a subject for the Committee on Appropriations. I might say to the House that certainly all of the projects that were submitted to our committee are not included in this bill, because, if they had been, this bill might have been double or more than the sum total that we bring to you. The total amount in this bill is about $890 million.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to advise the gentleman and the Members of the House that just this past week, on Sunday last, a disastrous flood hit the area right where some of these projects have been authorized. Had they been constructed, it would not have been necessary for the Federal Government to expend vast sums of money, which they have done in the past 2 or 3 days, and we are trying to rebuild bridges and restore homes and property that has been damaged.

Mr. DONDERO. Those are acts of God.

Mr. BAILEY. That would not happen if the Congress were alert to the situation that exists there. This is the area in which 85 or 86 people have been drowned in the last 10 years in this type of flood, and apparently nothing has been done about any of those authorized projects.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman will show his interest before the Committee on Appropriations in the next session of Congress.

H. R. 9859 carries a total authorization of $890,271,514. Appropriations for civil works for the fiscal years 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 have amounted to more than $1,563,000,000. In fact, this bill carries a total authorization that is approximately $30 million less than the civil-works appropriations for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

The 1950 bill left the House with an authorization total of $1,117,586,175. This bill carries an amount nearly a quarter of a billion dollars less than the 1950 House bill—the last omnibus bill.

At the present time approved active projects for navigation and flood control will cost an estimated $7,566,533,000 to complete. Projects amounting to an estimated total cost of $2,534,030,000 are deferred pending further study, while projects amounting to slightly more than a billion dollars are in an inactive status due to changed economic conditions and other factors arising subsequent to authorization.

In the process of developing this bill, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], held 42 meetings. The Subcommittee on Flood Control, headed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], held 41 meetings. Every project in the bill was carefully considered, and both proponents and opponents were given time to present their testimony. With only 2 or 3 exceptions, all projects were given unanimous approval both by the subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Throughout the numerous hearings held by subcommittees on the projects proposed, the Corps of Engineers presented the technical details of each project. Almost from the beginning of our history as a nation, the Corps of Engineers has been charged with the responsibility for navigation and harbor work, and, later, for flood-control projects. Its record in civil-works construction stands as a monument to this efficient agency of the Federal Government and to the fine work of its officers and civilian personnel. The corps deserves the highest commendation, and I am sure that every member of the Committee on Public Works joins me in this statement.

At this time I wish to publicly commend Mr. MACK and Mr. ANGELL, the chairmen of the Subcommittees on Navigation and Flood Control, for their diligence in carrying on the hearings. This year our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] completes 16 years of service in the House of Representatives, and I am sure all of us regret that he will retire at the close of this Congress. He is a man of outstanding ability and has been most diligent and attentive in his committee duties and congressional work throughout the years. He has a splendid record of service to the people of his district, the State of Oregon, and the Nation. The House, I am sure, will greatly miss him.

I recommend that this bill be given favorable consideration. I hope it will pass. It is not as large a bill as the former bill which came to the floor in 1950. It is of less amount. The reason that it should not be in an excessive amount is the fact that we have a backlog in this country of river and harbor and flood-control projects which will total about $10 billion. It would take almost 12 years to complete if they started work now. So that the necessity for a large bill is not here. This is a reasonable bill. I hope that the House will do as the Committee on Public Works did, support the bill unanimously.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I take this time simply to express my personal appreciation, which I know is shared by the Members of the House, for the uniform courtesy and consideration shown by the gentleman's committee and all of its members to those of us who have projects we feel are deserving projects. I believe the gentleman and his committee have rendered an important service in bringing this bill to the floor, and I want the RECORD to show my appreciation for the diligence and efforts of the gentleman's committee.

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

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

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman from Florida has taken the words right out of my mouth. The gentleman from Michigan should have yielded to me first. I, too, wish to congratulate the chairman and the members of this committee on bringing out this bill. Particularly, in behalf of the people of the Second Congressional District of the State of Washington, I want to express appreciation of the committee having heard me in testimony before the committee and having included six different projects from that area in this bill. It seems to me it is real recognition of the rivers and harbors in the far Northwest.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentlemen for their comments.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has devoted more hours to the work of this committee than any other and is more responsible for the provisions of this bill than any other is our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL is chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. He also is the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. Mr. ANGELL attended every session of both of those committees. Mr. ANGELL is the outstanding authority in the Congress on rivers and harbors and flood control. He has contributed much to his State, to the Pacific Northwest, and to the Nation.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] had intended to be here today to deliver his final speech in Congress, of which he has been a Member for 16 years. Illness, however, prevents that. He has requested that I ask that his remarks be inserted immediately following the remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], I ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I approve this bill and urge its adoption. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee it has been my privilege and duty to preside over the hearings which we have been conducting before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee during much of the time of the 83d Congress, with a view to passing upon the merits of the various river and harbor projects eligible for inclusion in this bill. There has not been an omnibus bill for rivers and harbors since 1950 and as a result there is a large accumulation of projects which have been examined in the field by the Corps of Army Engineers, approved and cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Public Works Committee. Our committee includes all such projects in one bill which has come to be known as an omnibus bill which permits the Congress to pass on all projects at one time rather than have them scattered throughout the session by individual bills. This procedure is a desirable one and results in the saving of much time for the Congress and at the same time gives adequate opportunity to pass upon the merits of each individual project included in the omnibus bill. Opportunity is given on the floor for any Member to make a motion to strike any particular item from the bill, which insures majority rule.

The Committee on Public Works, which under the Reorganization Act, has jurisdiction over rivers and harbors, flood control, public roads, and public buildings, has taken the opportunity during the 83d Congress to make inspection trips over most areas in the United States and to visit most of the important rivers and harbors in order to get first-hand information on the ground, as to the various projects coming before the committee for action. These trips included one along the Atlantic coast, through the New England States and along the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, down the Mississippi and along the Gulf States, the central portion of the United States in the Ohio River area and on west to the Pacific coast, including the States of Montana, Idaho, California, Washington, Oregon, and the Columbia Basin area.

During these inspection trips we made actual examination of the projects on the ground and gleaned much local history and factual information as to the merits and demerits of the various projects. At the conclusion of these field examinations I set down for hearings before the subcommittee the rivers and harbors and beach erosion projects which were eligible for inclusion in the bill.

I have heard it said that there is a backlog of approved rivers and harbors projects which would require many years for completion by the Army engineers and some comment to the effect that those should be completed before new projects should be considered. However, an examination by our committee into the merits of this suggestion and the appraisal of the projects now on the approved list as well as the new projects which are urgently needed to meet changing conditions shows the lack of merit in the suggestions and the necessity for authorizing the construction of many new projects urgently needed and the elimination of some projects heretofore approved which by reason of changing conditions are no longer justified.

It may be of interest to consider the background of river development and a bit of the history surrounding it as well as some statistical information which our committee has gathered in the various hearings we have held.

The water transportation system of the United States began with the founding of the Nation and recognition of Federal responsibility in navigation stems from the very beginning of these public works. Our committee has been advised by the Corps of Army Engineers that 1,769 authorizations on river and harbor projects have now been completed. There are a few multiple-purpose projects which include some navigation not included in this list. The total cost of this river improvement program was $856 million.

Projects or modifications which are now under way but not yet completed total 143. The committee records show that the projects underway involve an additional cost of $1,409,000,000 of which $878 million has been appropriated through the fiscal year 1954 and it is estimated that $531 million will be required to complete the projects.

In addition to the projects completed or underway there is another group not yet started totaling 254 in number, the total cost of which would be $911 million of which $5 million has been appropriated to date for planning purposes, leaving a total of $906 million to complete the construction of the projects.

It is thus seen from these tabulations that the total active navigation program amounts to 2,156 projects or project modifications, having a grand total of $3,176,000,000 of which $1,739,000,000 for the cost to date has been appropriated and $1,437,000,000 is the estimated cost to complete. These estimated costs to complete are based on the 1953 price levels.

In addition to the active program the Army engineers considering navigation projects have deferred for restudy 282 projects. These deferred projects are estimated to cost, if constructed, $1,170,000,000. The active authorized navigation program described included about 28,600 miles of improved waterways, about 300 locks, 200 dams, and 290 commercial harbors. This embraces all authorized navigation projects from those not yet started to those fully completed.

It is thus seen that the comprehensive program for river and harbor development throughout the United States has proceeded throughout our history on a coordinated program in which each project is based on careful and extended engineering studies authorized by the Congress and eventually submitted to the Public Works Committees having been cleared by the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

It is at this point in the proceedings that the work of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate take over to determine whether or not authorization for any specified project should be granted. The omnibus bill we are considering embodies the results of our deliberations and includes the projects which in the judgment of the committee are in the national interest, economically feasible, and desirable in furthering the needs of water transportation of the Nation both for war and peace.

The latest commercial statistics which are available are for the year 1952 and show that the net waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890 million tons in that year, of which about 660 million tons were domestic and 230 million tons were foreign. This is a 50 percent greater waterborne commerce than the prewar peak in the year 1929. The statistics given to our committee in

the consideration of the 1950 Rivers and Harbors Act, which was the predecessor to the present one, then amounted to an alltime total of 760 million tons reached in 1947, which has now been exceeded by more than 11 percent. In continuously mounting volume through the war years, traffic grew on the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, each year setting a new record in ton-miles of bargeborne freight. It should be recalled that in addition to their value as carriers of commercial cargo, the inland waterways were used to float 3,943 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary war equipment from inland shipyards down to the ocean. America's rivers and canals thus served a twofold purpose during the war. They shared importantly in the transportation of strategic materials and they made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes that otherwise would have been forced into congested coastal areas, with the hazards of bomb attack.

As I have said, this omnibus bill is the first one proposed since 1950 and needless to say it includes a large number of projects which have been accumulating. It covers 140 projects including 22 under beach erosin programs, with an estimated cost for the 140 projects of $890,271,514. Under the law governing beach erosion projects they are permissible only for the protection of public property and two-thirds of the cost must be borne by local interests and one-third by the Federal Government. It is estimated that the cost of beach erosion projects will be $14,300,664.

It is the thought of a good many students of our economic programs and national economy that it is a wise move for the Federal Government to have public projects of this nature examined and approved by the Army engineers so that their worth and economic feasibility may be established and have them available on the shelf of approved projects in the event of the need for public works to bolster our economy. In the meantime, however, such of the projects as are urgently needed for immediate construction are cleared for appropriation to enable construction to start.

I call attention to the fact that our committee is a legislative committee and merely authorizes projects and before construction can proceed the Appropriation Committee must provide the funds.

The economy of the United States, the foremost nation in the world, is based upon our immense wealth of natural resources and our productive capacity and know-how in this highly developed machine age. It behooves us to guard well our natural resources and exercise every effort for their preservation, utilization, and full development in order that we may continue to hold the front rank of the nations of the world in the ability to produce the necessities of life not only for our own people but for many of the less fortunate peoples of the world.

The late Theodore Roosevelt, as President of the United States in 1908, made a great contribution to this program for the conservation, development, utilization of our natural resources, and particularly the forest, minerals, waters, and soil. He said:

> Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.
>
> Running water is a most valuable natural asset of the people, and there is urgent need for conserving it for navigation, for power, for irrigation, and for domestic and municipal supply.
>
> The improvement of our inland waterways can be and should be made to pay for itself as far as practicable from the incidental proceeds from waterpower and other uses. Navigation should, of course, be free, but the greatest return will come from the increased commerce, growth, and prosperity of our people. For this we have already waited too long. Adequate funds should be provided, by bond issue if necessary, and the work should be delayed no longer. The development of our waterways and the conservation of our forests are two most pressing physical needs of the country. They are interdependent and they should be met vigorously, together, and at once. There is urgent need for prompt and decisive action.

President Theodore Roosevelt in pleading for the conservation and development of America's natural resources was only following the sage advice of another great American statesman of long ago, Daniel Webster, whose words are chiseled in the plaque over our Speaker's rostrum:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth it powers, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

As in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, there was need, as he said, for prompt and decisive action in the conservation and development of these great natural resources, so today we in our time and generation will be derelict in our duty and shortsighted in our vision if we fail to provide the necessary funds and legislation needed to conserve and protect to the full, these great natural resources which belong to all the people and which are being wasted and depleted. Unless we make possible the full use of our water, forests, soil, and hydroelectric power we will be unable to meet the heavy demands upon our economy and to provide for our own people the high standard of living they now enjoy, and at the same time to perform our full part in maintaining a peaceful and stable world.

As we visualize the immense billions the United States has expended around the world in attempting to bring peace to the world and good will among men of all nations, we cannot help but be impressed with the necessity of ending the worldwide race in armament in this age of the atomic and H-bombs and returning to international cooperation and the spiritual and moral values which dominated our forebears, with the hope that the millions expended in armaments and wars may be turned into channels of peace and internal improvements and improved standards of living in order to overcome hunger, disease, illiteracy, and despair which have been the prime causes of wars.

I believe with President Eisenhower—

> We are prepared to reaffirm with the most concrete evidence our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government is ready to ask the people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom. The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs rather than the fears of the world.

Mr. Chairman, there are no projects in this bill in my congressional district. There are, however, a few projects in Oregon, of which my district is a part, which I desire to call to your favorable consideration. One of these is the deepening of the channel of the Columbia River at the mouth from 40 to 48 feet and dredging jetties and providing groins if necessary in order to give safe access to the Columbia River ports of the large volume of waterborne traffic on the river. The use of the entrance channel as it exists today at times presents great hazards and danger to shipping.

There are some 18 port districts now formed on the Columbia River from its mouth to its confluence with the Snake. The Snake River is the most important tributary of the Columbia and with its great gorge—the deepest in the United States—it presents ideal conditions for the construction of dams, storage lakes, and hydroelectric-power projects, as well as providing river transportation. The dams on the Snake will not only provide navigation, flood control, reclamation, and the generation of hydroelectric power at the dam sites, but will provide an immense storage basin for preventing floods and also for storing water to increase the generating capacity of the many hydroelectric installations downstream on the Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Oregon, which I am privileged to represent, borders on the Columbia River and is in a strategic position in this great area, the Columbia River Basin. Truly the Pacific Northwest stands at the threshold of a coordinated regional development. The development and full utilization of the Columbia Basin's natural resources are the keys to the economy of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Fortunately the money invested in the development of these huge hydroelectric projects is a sound investment for the United States. The payout is ahead of schedule on the Bonneville project in my district and long before the amortization period expires the Federal Government will have received back the full cost with interest, upkeep, and maintenance. During the 16 years I have had the privilege of serving the people of the Third District of Oregon, I have devoted much of my time to the problems of conserving, developing, and utilizing to the full the great storehouse of natural resources in the Columbia River Basin. Few regions are blessed with such wealth of resources. The immense volume of water and hydropower of the Columbia River

coupled with fertile soil and an equitable climate provides a combination of factors which spell success and prosperity in the Pacific Northwest region.

This is true both from an industrial standpoint where great blocks of cheap hydroelectric power are needed and for agricultural development as well, which also requires both power and water.

The Pacific Northwest is a rich and growing region; it has immense natural resources of forests, agricultural and grazing land, water supply, minerals, fish and wildlife, scenic and recreational areas. With about 9 percent of the Nation's land area and 3 percent of the people, the Pacific Northwest has 40 percent of all merchantable timber, 20 percent of all irrigated acreage, 4 percent of all cropland, 20 percent of all developed waterpower, 40 percent of all potential hydroelectric power, 60 percent of all phosphate rock; large deposits of lead, zinc, silver, copper, and other minerals; 4,680,000 people in April 1950—a gain of one-third over 1940. The basic region deficiencies are oil, gas, and coal. To overcome these deficiencies it is imperative that we develop the immense pool of hydroelectric power with which we are blessed, with almost one-half of the available United States potential supply. Only some 11 percent has been developed thus far.

The Columbia River Basin is the greatest natural source of water and power resources not only in America but anywhere in the civilized world. By reason of the large drainage basin it covers, the river's flow is to a large extent continuous through most of the year, resulting in an unusual percentage of firm power in hydroelectric projects. This is an exceptionally valuable asset to large industries which need continuous firm power to maintain plant operation.

The growth of power requirement in the Northwest is the result of an extremely rapid growth in population coupled with expansion in electrification of farms, businesses, and industries in the area. In population growth, the Pacific Northwest has far outstripped the United States as a whole. In the period between 1940 to 1950, which is the major development period of the Bonneville Power Administration, the population of the State increased almost 50 percent. Besides having a population increase, more electricity than ever before is being used by all classes of customers. Farm, business, and industrial enterprises are rapidly finding new uses for power, and home consumption is steadily increasing.

I feel justified in having been a vigorous advocate of the development of these great resources of the Northwest not alone because they spell prosperity for the area, but because they are sound investments for the Nation as a whole. This Nation in the exercise of wisdom, instead of curtailing the development of these great revenue-producing projects, should make available the necessary funds for full development as rapidly as the demand for electric energy requires. Federal funds invested in these public works is in the interest of economy.

During my service I have seen the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects through the development stage. We are now well advanced in construction of the McNary Dam and Chief Joseph project on the Columbia and in the early stages of construction of the Dalles project on the same river. The Columbia River and its tributaries has the greatest potential storehouse of electric power of any waterway in the Nation, some 20 million kilowatts, of which only 11 percent has been developed, as I have said. The remainder of this great source of energy and power is flowing to the sea without let or hindrance, with a resulting loss of untold wealth to our people and the loss of millions in revenues which would come into the coffers of the United States. The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts which is equivalent in energy to 8,800,000 barrels of oil. Only 15 units of the Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28 million barrels annually. When McNary Dam is completed, the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts, and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5 million barrels will be consumed. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be in round numbers 290 million barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydropower in our future economy.

Unfortunately we have no large deposits of gas, coal, or oil in the Pacific Northwest, but the enormous pool of hydroelectric power stored in the Columbia and other rivers compensates for this loss. The McNary Dam project alone will provide the necessary energy for industries which will have a total investment of $100 million and which will supply employment to 100,000 residents of the Northwest. It is estimated that benefits to navigation from this great dam will reach a million dollars a year, and it will reduce pumping costs for the lands adjacent to the pool approximately $300,000 a year. The power alone generated at this huge project will return to the Government $17,500,000 a year to produce which 3 million tons of coal or 11 million barrels of oil would be required. It is significant to recall that hydroelectric power is not expendable like oil, gas, or coal, and that as long as the sun shines and water falls this great source of energy will work around the clock in the interests of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest.

While the hydroelectric power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries, the greatest in the United States, is of immense value to the entire region and to the Nation, nevertheless this great waterway with its continuous flow of a huge volume of water available down through the centuries for navigation, reclamation, domestic and industrial use, is of greater value and is one of the greatest assets that is possessed by any area anywhere in the world.

We in this great new continent of America, with its wealth of natural resources, should not underestimate the favored position in which we find ourselves and the blessings that are ours. As has been said, let us confess that our great good fortune is not because we in America are one whit better or more deserving of God's blessings, but simply because we have the tremendous virgin resources of a new continent to divide among only 160 million skilled people, while in Asia nearly 1,500,000,000 unskilled people must divide the meager resources of a long-used continent.

The Columbia River from its source in Canada down through the great hinterland lying between the Pacific Ocean and the Continental Divide is a natural outlet for the commerce of this great region. The water-level haul from the Pacific Ocean through the Columbia River and Snake River Gorge to Lewiston in central Idaho serves an area equal to an empire in scope. On the bosom of this great river the heavily laden barges move to and fro from the ocean as far as the river has already been developed for transportation. The United States Corps of Engineers' Report 308, approved by the Congress, covers a comprehensive plan for the full development of this great river basin and when the projects there listed and approved have been fully constructed transportation on this great river will be provided from the Pacific Ocean to Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, another project included in this bill is a flood-control authorization for the Columbia River and Willamette River Basins under the Flood Control Acts of 1938 and 1950. The comprehensive plan of development for the Columbia River Basin will produce numerous benefits throughout the area. The main control plan, including such reservoirs as The Dalles, which is under construction, together with the levees, floodwalls, and bank-protection projects, will reduce flood damages in the lower basin by more than 90 percent. The plan of improvement, in addition to controlling floods on the lower Columbia River, will also provide effective control on the Willamette, Kootenai, and Snake Rivers, and maximum protection economically feasible on other tributaries. The projects of the plan will also permit full development and extend inland navigation on the Columbia, Snake, and Willamette Rivers. In addition, the multiple-purpose reservoirs will greatly increase the presently available power capacity of the Federal projects in the basin. Other benefits accruing to the plan of improvement are those resulting from the irrigation of arid lands, pollution abatement, domestic and industrial water supplies, and recreation. Many benefits are not subject to monetary evaluation but nevertheless are very realistic; these include prevention of loss of life, improved standards of living, and stabilization of business and employment.

The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers that, based upon an appropriation

schedule designed to permit economical and orderly progress on continuation of needed flood control and related works in the Columbia River Basin, it is estimated that an amount of approximately $75 million will be required during fiscal year 1956, and an amount of approximately $115 million will be required during fiscal year 1957. These amounts are about $180 million in excess of the available monetary authorization. The committee has therefore included authorization in the bill in the amount of $180 million for continuation of the comprehensive plan.

The major portion of this authorization is needed for The Dalles Dam project. This is a most important project in the economy of the Pacific Northwest and is proceeding full speed at the present time. It is one of the most important projects for power on the Columbia River, only second to Grand Coulee.

With each passing year it is more plainly evident that the most dynamic influence on the economy of the Northwest is coming from the harnessing of the great power potentials of its large and numerous streams. The Columbia River and its tributaries carry an amount of water which represents approximately one-fourth of the annual runoff of the major power streams of the country. When fully developed this great river alone can provide approximately 30 percent of the hydroelectric power generation of the entire country. When other streams of the Northwest are added the total is in excess of 40 percent. As of January 1, 1953, only 11.6 percent of this total capacity had been utilized through operating plants. Projects now under construction or authorized will bring this total to near 15 percent of the potential.

But this partial harnessing of the great power resources has been sufficient to literally electrify or energize the economic life of the Northwest and to demonstrate the essentials of future plans for logical and orderly development.

Not only are the installed capacities and undeveloped potentials impressive when compared with the country as a whole, but the low costs of power generation make this the area of lowest power prices in the United States. The benefits of this low-cost hydropower have been made widely available to the domestic consumers of the Northwest and a matching low level of rates has been provided for industry. This has had great significance in the Nation's war and postwar defense program.

The rapid growth of the aluminum reduction industry in the Pacific Northwest is the result of alert action by leaders of the region and progressive development of cheap hydroelectric power. There were no aluminum reduction plants in the area prior to 1940. However, by 1944 the Pacific Northwest's capacity to produce aluminum from alumina—shipped in from other areas—amounted to 310,000 net tons, or 28 percent of the national total. By December 1952 the region's capacity had grown to 498,300 tons, an increase of 58 percent over 1944, and to 41 percent of the national capacity. The Big Three of the aluminum industry—Alcoa, Kaiser, and Reynolds—have been in the region for some time. It is expected that 104,000 tons of new capacity may be added during 1954—by the Harvey Machine Co., 54,000 tons, and the Anaconda Copper Co., 50,000 tons. For continued expansion of the aluminum and other industries there will have to be rapid development of more hydroelectric power, which is the region's greatest resource. Luckily, it is not exhaustible like natural gas or oil, and some other forms of energy.

I urge favorable consideration of two other Oregon projects in the bill, Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.—Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress, 2d session—and Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River, at Reedsport, Oreg.—Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress, 2d session.

The Rogue River is located in the southwest corner of Oregon, draining 5,080 square miles. The river generally flows westward into the Pacific Ocean 264 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River and 319 miles north of San Francisco. The plan of recommended improvement provides for two jetties at the entrance of Rogue River, a channel 13 feet deep and 300 feet wide from the ocean to a point immediately below the State highway bridge, and widening channel at a point 0.25 mile below highway bridge to form turning basin 13 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 650 feet long.

Estimated cost	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document	$3, 758, 700	$163, 800	$3, 922, 500
Current	3, 758, 700	163, 800	3, 922, 500

In addition to the direct benefits that would accrue if the improvement is constructed, business would be stimulated, property values increased, and utilization of the Nation's timber resources would be increased. Trucking is at present the only form of transportation in the area. This project is in the area of a large stand of commercial timber, much of it owned by the Federal Government. Water transportation is urgently needed to market the ripe timber both privately and federally owned.

The Umpqua River, Oreg., empties into the Pacific Ocean 178 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River. Scholfield River rises south of the Umpqua River and flows northwestward about 13 miles to its confluence with Umpqua River at Reedsport, Oreg.

There is no existing project on Scholfield River. This project for Umpqua River provides for a jetty-protected entrance channel 26 feet deep and a river channel 22 feet deep, 200 feet wide, and about 11 miles long to Reedsport; together with turning and mooring basins and various widths and depths to Gardiner, Oreg.

The plan of recommended improvement provides for a channel in Scholfield River 12 feet deep, generally 100 feet wide, from its confluence with the Umpqua River to a point 0.5 mile below the first railroad bridge, a distance of 2 miles, the entrance to be widened to 300 feet in a distance of 500 feet.

Estimated cost	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document	$41, 000	$10, 000	$51, 000
Current	41, 000	10, 000	51, 000

Local interests have offered to provide additional terminal facilities on the Scholfield River as needed, and to contribute $10,000 toward the first cost of the improvement if the dredged material is deposited in a specified area. The Chief of Engineers recommends acceptance of this cash contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this may be my last opportunity to say a farewell to you and my colleagues. One of the greatest joys of my 16 years' service here has been this wealth of friendships with you, my colleagues, which I will cherish as long as God grants my stay on earth. The seemingly endless days of toil and frustrations have knit together the strong and abiding ties of personal associations and friendships. With you I have tried with such power as God has given me to build a better America, to provide for all our citizens high and low the blessings of freedom and a sharing in the bounties with which divine providence has blessed us.

Mr. Chairman, since I am ending my 16 years' service in the Congress I may be pardoned for a personal reference. My background has been such as to instill in me a deep and abiding interest in the abundant natural resources of the Pacific Northwest. My parents came to Oregon by ox team in 1852, where I was born and raised, and I have spent all of my life in Oregon and much of it in working for the conservation, development, and utilization of these vast natural resources. For many years I was engaged on public-land surveys in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, which gave me an opportunity to secure firsthand information of the extent, the character, and the value of the unmatched natural resources of this great area. This, as well as my training and experience as a lawyer, has enabled me here in the Congress to plead with my colleagues for the development of these resources which has resulted in favorable consideration at their hands. I take some pride in reporting that in the years in which I have served in the Congress the Columbia River has received in authorizations and appropriations for the development of navigation, reclamation, hydropower, and flood control deserved favorable consideration. It has received more appropriations for public works, many times over, than in any other like period in history.

Mr. Chairman, two subjects involving national legislation have been foremost in my entire service in the Congress. One is the conservation, development and utilization of the immense wealth of natural resources of our Nation on which our economy depends and which I have discussed in these remarks. The other is the adoption of a Federal old-age security program, nationwide, which will deal justly with the aged, handicapped and disabled who otherwise would be in

need and want. If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problems of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era, and with the commercial development of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from active labor force, hit-or-miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are not covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation.

The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are now millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support from any source, or hopelessly inadequate support.

The plan which I have advocated and sponsored during my congressional service would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It is financed by a gross income tax in which all participate. It is a pay-as-you-go system, and annuities will be paid currently each month out of currently raised revenues. This proposal gives recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth of American industry which they helped to create. These annuities are provided for those self-respecting American citizens as a matter of right, without reference to need or prior contributions, and with neither the stigma of charity nor the aroma of poverty.

I take considerable satisfaction in knowing that during the years of my work here, the Congress has from time to time enacted amendments to the social-security system under which a gradual advance has been made toward a solution of this most important old-age security problem. The coverage has been materially increased to take in many thousands of worthy citizens who otherwise would be without help, and the monthly payments have been substantially increased. However, the ultimate goal has not yet been achieved; namely, a nationwide system which will cover all and which will provide adequate annuities so that these worthy and deserving citizens will have ample income in their declining years to live with decency and health in accordance with the living standards of their friends and neighbors. Ultimately the full goal, I am sure, will be attained.

Mr. Chairman, during all my service in this great forum I have labored ceaselessly and ever with a fervent desire and hope that this great peace-loving Nation and the freedom-loving nations of the world find a solution to the conflicts and devastating wars between the nations of the world.

This troubled world seeking ways to solve its problems should be turning increasingly to those inexhaustible spiritual resources of divine strength and moral courage as a practical way to rebuild better government, better society, and friendly cooperation in a misguided and distraught world beset with wars, greed, and selfishness. How these fundamental spiritual values can be applied to solve the problems that face the world today is your problem and mine, and may indeed, determine the destiny of this great Republic.

God grant that the time will come in our time when the leaders of all nations of the world, realizing the dreadful cost of war in human life and national wealth, and its utter futility in the solution of international, political, and economic problems, will be willing to sit around the conference table and decide the problems which now separate them, by peaceful negotiation instead of by bombs and guns. If the lives lost in war were devoted to useful occupations and the betterment of mankind, and the immense sums of money expended in the preparation of war, waging war, and the care of the injured and rehabilitation of the destruction wrought by war, were devoted to useful purposes such as great public works throughout the nations, river and harbor improvements, hydroelectric production, hospitals, schools, roads, public and private housing, higher standards of living for the downtrodden, and old-age security, the millennium would indeed have been reached.

Somewhere down through the ages we have lost the sustaining faith of our Founding Fathers that the Almighty is on our side; that He "moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform." As the late Senator Vandenberg said:

> With unwavering fidelity we must carry on the great adventure of life, but if there be any failure, let not the blood be upon our hands, nor the tragedy upon our souls. The United States has no ulterior design against any of its neighbors anywhere on earth. We can speak with the extraordinary power inherent in this unselfishness. We need but one rule. What is right? Where is justice? There let America take her stand.

Let us follow in the footsteps of the immortal Lincoln who in the dark days of 1865 said:

> With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to pay homage to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors for his hard and diligent work on this omnibus rivers and harbors bill, also to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and also the illustrious chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. May I say, too, that during these many months of hearings the minority side was represented at all times, and I should like to pay tribute to the minority members for the long hours they worked on these hearings.

The projects that are in this bill have had long study by the Army engineers. There were also many hearings held on each and every project by the subcommittee. Then they were reported to the full committee, and the full committee spent long hours going over the work of the subcommittee.

We feel that these are new and important projects and that they are necessary to be authorized at this time so that in the near future the Committee on Appropriations can act. All of these projects are in this country. All of them are for the expansion of our own economy. I feel that in an ever-growing country we need to keep pace with the business of the country and expand our rivers and harbors, also protect the investment of many farms and cities with flood-control projects. I do feel it is a good bill. It was passed unanimously by our committee. I urge this House to adopt it today.

On January 9, 1953, I introduced a bill in Congress, H. R. 9520, calling for the deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to 35 feet and its widening to 450 feet, as well as other improvements recommended by the Army engineers. The proposed project has been approved by the Federal Bureau of the Budget, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and has the endorsement of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, as well as other leading port interests. The Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives held hearings on my bill and approved it unanimously for inclusion in the rivers and harbors and flood control omnibus bill, which is being considered by the House today.

I need not remind my colleagues of the important and useful part that water transportation plays in the national economy. Fortunately for us, the Federal rivers and harbors program has produced the best system of navigable waterways and harbors possessed by any nation. The Congress has appropriated to date more than $4 billion for improving and maintaining these waterways and harbors. But there are some weak links in this strong national chain of water transportation. And standing out like a sore thumb is the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

Generally the improvement of our waterways has been a progressive development in an effort to keep pace with the growth of maritime commerce and the requirements for national defense.

But the facts show plainly that the improvement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has not kept pace. Here is the picture.

The present canal is a bottleneck between the two great Atlantic ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia. The proposed project will join these two cities by direct deepwater route, thus adding substantially to the combined service which they can render on behalf of the Nation's waterborne commerce, both domestic and foreign. Considering that this project is only about 46 miles in total length, its completion will come close to making the 2 ports as 1. At a very nominal cost compared to the resultant benefits from eliminating the existing bottleneck, the long and expensive voyage of some 300 miles now required for larger ships plying between these ports by way of the Virginia Capes can be avoided. As a matter of simple economy, the savings in time and increased flexibility of ship operations are sufficient to justify the improvement.

As a result of the Federal program for navigation improvements, channel depths of 35 feet or better now prevail at principal harbors on the Atlantic seaboard or gulf coast. The existing 27-foot channel in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal does not permit the full loading of vessels as at these ports. It is wholly inadequate to handle ocean liners and modern tankers often loaded to depths of 33 feet. The proposed deepening to 35 feet will provide the necessary depths to meet shipping needs and will benefit the whole Atlantic coast through increased shipping.

The present canal of 250-feet width is not a safe waterway. In addition to insufficient depths there are three leading hazards for vessels—the narrow channel, bad bends, and had bridges. In the past, tankers have been wrecked and tied up in the canal for months or a whole season. The proposed widening of the canal to 450 feet, easing of bends and provision of new bridges will provide a much safer waterway, in addition to eliminating the costly delays.

Baltimore is one of the Nation's leading ports in total inbound shipments of merchandise and serves as a gateway for a wide range of manufactured commodities, grain, and other agricultural products from the West. Development of new iron ore fields in Labrador will serve to supply additional traffic in the future. Major steel companies interested in these new fields are now planning the construction of large ore carriers, as well as other facilities, which will make the port of Baltimore the largest and most modern ore unloading facility of any port in the country. In addition, major railroads serving Baltimore have long recommended that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal improvements be carried out, as the improved canal would permit the movement of full shiploads of coal from the rail terminals at Baltimore to the New England areas. It stands to reason that modernizing the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal would, through increased foreign and domestic trade, serve to aid the growth of the Nation as well as the port of Baltimore.

This waterway has great potenital value for national defense. Records indicate that the canal was particularly valuable to the Nation during World War II. Further, if improved, it would provide Baltimore with two 35 feet or better exits to and from the sea, the only major port in such a position. The protected passage between Baltimore and Philadelphia enlarged to real seaway proportions would accommodate our large naval vessels, such as destroyers and cruisers, and would be of greatly increased value to our defense and security.

As sponsor of this project, I most earnestly endorse the widening and deepening of the inland waterway connecting the Delaware River with Chesapeake Bay and feel it even more necessary now than ever before because of the great challenge presented by the St. Lawrence Seaway to the ports of the Atlantic.

The people of Maryland have had a close interest in the canal reconstruction for the past three decades. To them, the proposed project to convert it into a major deep sea waterway is like a dream come true.

I maintain and recommend that this project should be promptly authorized in order that modernization work may soon be initiated in the interest of the growing economic needs and safety of the Nation.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, because of the vital role of the Philadelphia port area in our national defense effort, the project of deepening the Delaware River from Philadelphia-Camden to the Trenton area to 40 feet is a matter which concerns not only the civil authorities, businessmen, and citizens of this locality but the Nation as a whole.

More than a year ago the United States Steel Co. began production at its new Fairless plant on the Delaware River below Morrisville, Pa., near Trenton, N. J. Consequently the Philadelphia-Camden area has become one of the Nation's greatest steel producing districts. The operation of this multimillion dollar integrated steel plant, its subsidiaries and other related industries in the area demands the facility of oceangoing transports as they require a marked increase in waterborne tonnage. This factor alone should justify the modification of the Delaware River Channel above Allegheny Avenue to Trenton to accommodate seagoing ore boats, colliers, tankers, and other deep draft vessels. An improved channel would also provide for the shipment of finished steel by water freight direct from the steel companies' docks.

By opening up the Delaware River to the city of Trenton, a vast hitherto untapped area can become useful to defense production and economic development over and above the extent to which it is being utilized at present. The Fairless steelworks has brought to the Morrisville area many satellite companies whose output is suitable to defense production.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers has made a thorough study of conditions in the Delaware River Channel. They have recommended improvements to navigation on the Delaware River that would add some 60 miles of deepwater harbor capabilities which will result in a large increase in low-cost transportation in this great and rapidly expanding commercial district. The Corps of Engineers also specifically stated that the benefits to the defense program and future normal peacetime economy by improving navigation on the Delaware River are such as to warrant construction of the project. The requirements by local interests for an increased depth of channel were found to be real and essential. It has also been found that the depths of water in our seaports and channels are limiting factors in the marine design of tankers and bulk cargo carriers.

There can be no question as to the importance of the Delaware River Valley to the national economy and national defense. The Congress would certainly be justified in authorizing this project and appropriating the necessary funds as recommended by the Corps of Engineers as well as the civic and industrial leaders of the Philadelphia-Camden area.

As pointed out in the following editorial from today's Philadelphia Inquirer, deepening of the Delaware River Channel is recommended by all elements of labor because of its significance to the economic future of Delaware Valley, United States of America:

UNITED DELAWARE VALLEY BACKS DEEPER CHANNEL BASIN

Rarely does the United States Congress have before it a measure which commands such united and wholehearted support as the proposed allocation of $91 million for deeping the upper Delaware River channel to Trenton.

Doubly effective is the support now coming from both railroads and rail labor. Ordinarily one might expect them to hesitate before endorsing expansion of a competing medium of transportation. But as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers stated, in a letter to Members of Congress:

"We feel the railroads of this territory would have an increase in business, making more work for railroad employees."

This general viewpoint was driven home in letters and statements by officials of both the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads, by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

Lined up in solid support, too is the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, with former President James L. McDevitt sending a persuasive letter to Senator PRESCOTT S. BUSH, chairman of the Public Works Committee which unanimously approved the measure.

It is this aggressive and vigilant mobilization of public opinion which gives Delaware Valley its best hope of getting the channel project through Congress at this session. The biggest obstacles we face are not outright opposition, based on active objection, but (a) the danger of the channel bill being swamped, lost or forgotten in the rush of Congress toward adjournment, and (b) the many other money claims for other projects which Congress must consider.

That's why it is vital to keep hammering home the main theme—the overall goal—of the deeper channel to Trenton: Expansion

of Delaware Valley, and with it expansion of prosperity for the Nation.

We can think of no one measure more likely to spur the Eisenhower program of prosperity than the deeper Delaware channel.

No theory is involved here. Proof is at hand. Delaware Valley is growing fast. Visibly. Needed is the deeper channel so this march forward will be neither halted nor slowed down—but aided in creating more industries, more employment, more homes.

It has been said that keeping everlastingly at it brings success. That is a good motto for all of us in these windup days of Congress.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been concern expressed by some Philadelphians and others interested in the proposed project for the improvement of the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to Trenton that it is not included in this omnibus authorization bill. I want the RECORD to show that this project is very much in my mind as this bill comes before the House and that there is a very valid reason why it has not been included in this bill.

First of all, the project for the Delaware River cleared the various administrative hurdles—approval by the Board of Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and so on—only after the schedule for hearings by the House Public Works Committee had been made up.

While it might still have been possible to have the House hearings reopened or continued to include the Delaware River project, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Chairman MARTIN, of the Senate Public Works Committee, agreed to hold hearings on this project before his committee and this was done. There is no doubt that the Delaware River project is slated for inclusion in the omnibus bill now before us when that bill gets over to the Senate.

Under those circumstances, and in view of the fact that no hearings on this matter were held by the House committee, it is our feeling that there would be no value in an attempt here to have the project written into this bill from the floor. It could do more harm than good, for if it were voted down on the grounds that the House committee had not had an opportunity to hold hearings on it, it might jeopardize the chances of having the project retained in the final conference bill, assuming the Senate writes it into the measure in the first place.

It should perhaps be explained, Mr. Chairman, that the House and Senate Public Works Committees try insofar as possible not to duplicate hearings on the same projects, unless strong opposition should develop in a particular area to a project approved for that area by the House committee. In that event, the Senate committee will often hold a hearing to review the House action. But normally, if the House committee schedules certain projects for hearings, the Senate committee will schedule other projects for its hearings, and in that way they cover double the amount of ground without duplicating their efforts.

So I am perfectly satisfied in this matter that it was good strategy to have Senator MARTIN's committee in the Senate conduct the hearing on the Delaware River project for two reasons: first, it came out of the Army so late that there was a strong possibility House committee hearings could not be arranged for it in time for inclusion in this bill; and, second, Senator MARTIN is thoroughly familiar with the importance of this project and could be expected to show more than routine interest in it.

All things considered, then, there is no reason for concern that the Delaware River project is not included in the House bill, since it will certainly, I am sure, be in the Senate version. Once that occurs, it will be up to all of us in the House who are anxious to see this project go through to make sure that it is included in the final conference bill.

I noticed several days ago the Philadelphia Inquirer expressed concern editorially about this matter, urging a floor fight to get it into the House bill. I hope my statement clears the air on this, and explains why no such floor fight is being made at this time.

Everybody admires a good fight, but there is no sense in fighting just for the sake of fighting, and particularly when a fight might jeopardize rather than help in the achievement of our goal.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to members of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives for their favorable action in authorizing construction of urgently needed levees along the American River near the city of Sacramento. This is one of the very important flood-control measures included in the omnibus public works authorization bill. The committee was faced with an extremely difficult job in considering the many important public-works projects proposed for authorization, but they did the job expeditiously and efficiently.

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Washington, Congressman MACK, who is chairman of the subcommittee responsible for action on flood-control matters. His most courteous treatment of me and of officials from the Sacramento area in dicussions of the matter—and the courtesies extended us by the other subcommittee members—is highly appreciated.

The action approving this important levee will be of great help to one of the fastest growing residential and industrial areas in the United States. The full growth of the area has been blocked by floods and the threat of floods. Flood danger soon will become greater because of the construction of Folsom Dam upstream from Sacramento.

The important dam, which is part of the flood-control network of the Central Valley project, is designed to release a maximum of 115,000 cubic feet of water per second, and engineers expect this maximum release to be made at regular intervals as rain from winter storms or spring runoff from melting snows rush into the reservoir. This will mean that the force of floods in the area to be protected by the Amercian River levee would be diminished, but their frequency would be increased.

By approving the project, therefore, the Congress will be recognizing its responsibility for correcting a situation made worse by previous governmental action. In addition, the levee will add a flood-safe area where homes and businesses can be established by the many persons moving into our section of California.

May I express again the sincere thanks of the people of the Third Congressional District for the action of the committee and of the entire House of Representatives in helping them solve a difficult problem.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9859, and I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the other members of the Committee on Public Works, for reporting out what in my opinion is one of the best bills of this type that has ever been reported to the House for consideration.

I am particularly grateful to the chairman and the members of the committee for approving the Old River control structure project because the hearings before the Public Works Committee established that this project could be properly classed as an emergency project.

The Old River closure project is in no wise a local project. It cannot be defined as a project affecting only the State of Louisiana. Rather, it is a project affecting most of the Southern States directly, and the entire United States indirectly. So in thanking the distinguished chairman and members of the committee for approving this project I speak for a great majority of our fellow Americans living throughout the entire Mississippi Valley. By approval of this project and the plans and specifications of the Army engineers in constructing the project, no doubt the Atchafalaya River will be prevented from capturing the Mississippi River at its confluence with Old River and following the shortest course to the Gulf of Mexico. If such a diversion had been allowed to take place, in all probability, the damage to the economy of the Mississippi Valley would have been in the billions of dollars.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am already on record in endorsing the proposal to improve the inland waterway connecting the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River. I extend and reaffirm that endorsement.

Considering the great benefits to be derived from the improved Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the cost must be viewed as nominal. From the standpoint of national defense, the deepwater connection between the great ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia has already proved to be of primary importance. Its

usefulness in time of emergency would be increased considerably by the improvements recommended by the Chief of Engineers. During wartime, ships plying this inland waterway would be completely protected from the danger of hostile craft. Unquestionably this would be a contribution to national defense of the first magnitude.

The improvements to the Chesapeake and Delaware Waterway will be important to the peacetime economy also. The canal provides a short, inland route for oceangoing vessels moving between Baltimore and New York, Boston, and Europe, and South America. Reports indicate that a saving in time of 20 hours will be realized by the average vessel enroute from Baltimore to the Delaware River area.

An immediate economic benefit would be an improvement of the water transportation service to the thousands of industrial concerns situated in the region. It is reasonable to expect that good water transportation facilities will attract additional industries to the region.

The arguments are overwhelmingly favorable to the completion of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal proposal. Therefore I urge that action be taken to proceed with this project without delay by adopting the provision contained in this bill H. R. 9859, for the widening and deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. It merits our support.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard work that has been expended by the members of the Public Works Committee upon this measure, and I shall give it my support. However, I am disappointed that the committee failed to accept the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers with reference to proposed projects for the Holla Bend levee district and the Conway County drainage and levee district, both of which I believe to be essential to adequate protection of valuable land against recurring floods on the Arkansas River. I trust that these projects will be embraced in this measure before final action is taken by the Congress.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation, and I am sure that of all my colleagues from Illinois, to the distinguished chairman and members of the committee, especially the able Illinois member, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, who so outstandingly champions the best interests of Chicago and the Nation, for including the beach-erosion program. It is of great interest to our people—not only to the people of the district I have the honor to represent, but to the people of other districts in Chicago. We do appreciate the action of the committee. May I ask one question which I will be asked to answer when I go home to my people. Referring to page 96 of the report, I notice that the city of Chicago is required to pay a larger part of the cost than suburban communities. May I have an answer to that question?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the chairman of our committee, if he has the record before him so that he may answer the gentleman from Illinois. I do not remember the details of all 92 projects.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 96 of the report that suburban communities will pay a lower percentage of the cost than will the city of Chicago. I presume there is a good reason for it, but I will be asked that question when I go home and I would appreciate an answer from the chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I will look into the matter and answer the gentleman later, before we conclude debate.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the chairman very much. The district that I have the honor to represent runs along Lake Michigan from 39th Street southward and we have a vital interest in the program emanating after long study from the Corps of Engineers and which offers a promising solution to the problem of beach erosion that has been perplexing us. Naturally I would not wish the city of Chicago, which already is sorely pressed to find the money for the many services required of it, to receive less aid in proportion to other communities. It is true that we have along the lakefront in Chicago more and finer public bathing beaches than any city in the world. These are maintained by the people of Chicago for all the people, both our own residents and those we are delighted to have visit us and share with us our beaches, our parks, and the other attractions of our great and happy metropolis. I presume that this figures in the apparent discrepancy of the percentage of Federal aid Chicago will receive to that authorized for neighboring communities. I am sure the distinguished chairman's statement will clarify the matter.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, 4 years have passed since the last omnibus rivers and harbors bill was passed by Congress and therefore many projects are now demanding attention. The Corps of Engineers has carefully screened these projects and selected for approval only those which were considered of the greatest importance, either to the area in which they were located, or to the Nation as a whole, and frequently to both.

The navigation system has been the responsibility of the Federal Government since the Nation was founded, and the investment made in the program has resulted in substantial and widespread benefits from the standpoint of economics and national welfare. It has contributed to foreign and domestic commerce and to the security and growth of the Nation.

Of vital importance to the port of Baltimore is the proposed program recommended for the inland waterway from the Delaware River to the Chesapeake Bay, known as the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The completion of this work would greatly affect the volume of shipping through the port of Baltimore, now the second largest port on the east coast, and on which the economy of the city of Baltimore, and in fact, the whole State of Maryland depends.

In the past, many of the larger ships have bypassed Baltimore because the canal has not been of sufficient width and depth to enable them to use it. To have availed themselves of the facilities offered by the port of Baltimore would have entailed many additional miles of travel. For example, the use of the canal would reduce the travel distance from Baltimore to New York or New England ports by 150 miles, and between Baltimore and many European ports, by 115 miles, which would mean a saving in operational costs as well as in sailing times.

The widening and deepening of the canal, and the replacement of movable-span bridges with high-level fixed structures, as proposed in H. R. 9859, will go far toward making the port of Baltimore more accessible to the large vessels.

The improved waterway will also provide an inland route from Philadelphia to Cape Henry, connecting two of the Navy's principal shipyards. Furthermore, it would permit the transportation of coal from the newly developed coal fields in West Virginia, through the local rail terminals in Baltimore, to the new England area, at considerably less expense.

Navigation through the waterway at the present time is exceedingly hazardous and results in much damage to vessels and bridges. Some accidents have tied up traffic there for weeks at a time. Improving the canal by increasing the depth to 35 feet and the width to 450 feet, is essential as an aid to navigation and would permit two-way, day and night traffic, by large vessels.

On the basis of past traffic through the canal, which has, incidentally, far exceeded all expectations, there is every reason to believe that future traffic will avail itself of the use of the canal to the greatest extent the canal will permit.

In times of war, the inland waterways developed at the Government's expense, have been a valuable asset. During the last war, the inland waterways were used to float almost 4,000 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary equipment from inland shipyards to the ocean. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal accommodated 924 trips by naval vessels, mostly Coast Guard and the auxiliary naval craft. Furthermore, as part of the inland waterway system, ships were able to avoid the hazard from enemy submarines between the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware Bay entrances, thus reducing the amount of convoying required. The proposed improvements would increase its value and potential, should there be another emergency, and also permit vessels of larger size to avoid the ocean route.

In addition to their importance in the transportation of strategic materials during the war, the inland rivers and canals made possible the widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes, that otherwise would have been forced into the already congested coastal areas.

Some concern has been expressed as to the possibility of the pollution of the Delaware River and its effect on wild life in the area, because of this work. However, the Chief of Engineers has pointed out that the tidal flows in the existing canal return more water to the river than they draw from it, and there is little reason to believe that the condition would be reversed if the canal were widened and deepened. He has also assured us that the improvements are not expected to have any adverse effect on the quality of water in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

With the increasing use of larger vessels, improvement of our navigation program is necessary. The use of the larger vessels in transportation, will mean greater economy, with its resultant lowered cost to the consumer.

Under the circumstances, while the improvements to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal recommended in this bill, approved by the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, will be of great value to the people of Maryland, they will also prove of equally great benefit to the Nation as a whole, insofar as general commerce and the national defense are concerned. Therefore, I cannot too strongly urge the approval of this project by the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9859 contains authorizations for two projects in my district which are exceedingly important to New Hampshire. For improvements in the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River there is an authorization of $952,000. For the beach erosion project at Hampton Beach there is an authorization of $140,000. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Public Works for including the river and harbor project and the beach erosion project in H. R. 9859. These projects are vital to the State of New Hampshire.

The New Hampshire coastline is short—just under 18 miles in length. On this coast we have one of the finest harbors in the East and one of the most popular beaches. Both are exceedingly important to the economic life of the State.

The harbor at Portsmouth never freezes. The channel in places is 70 feet deep and the shallowest points are about 40 feet deep. It is unfortunate, however, that in the harbor and the Piscataqua River there are rock obstructions. Their removal to permit the entrance of larger boats would be a tremendous industrial stimulus not only to the immediate locality, but to the entire area.

As early as 1885 and 1886 reports were submitted to the Senate in Executive Document 44 of the 49th Congress. In 1916 reports were submitted to the 63d Congress on Portsmouth Harbor. These reports were for the purpose of determining the advisability of further improvements in the interest of navigation, including the removal of Gangway Rock and improvement work at the southwest point of Badgers Island. I refer briefly to these prior reports to point out that from 1916 to 1948 no action had been taken to bring about the improvements in the river and harbor. If the rock obstructions could be removed, New Hampshire would have an excellent deepwater port the year round.

REVIEW RESOLUTION—ENGINEERS' REPORT—H. R. 4938

On December 22, 1948, I conducted a hearing in Portsmouth for the purpose of discussing the subject of harbor and river improvements. Convincing evidence that the proposed improvements would be worth while and were justified in view of the industrial development which would soon follow was presented. Early in 1949 I submitted the record of this hearing to the Public Works Committee of the House and on February 17, 1949, the committee adopted a resolution for a survey of the Federal project already in existence over many years. In June 1952 the Chief of Engineers submitted a report on the harbor and the river recommending the removal of the rock obstructions, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government.

On April 30, 1953, I introduced H. R. 4938, a bill to authorize funds in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. The Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oregon, Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL, gave me an excellent hearing on July 17, 1953. Several witnesses appeared before the subcommittee testifying on the importance of the project. The facts presented clearly demonstrated that the improvements of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River by removal of the obstructions would result in widespread benefits to the economic life of New Hampshire. Such improvements will be of a permanent nature since there is no silting in the harbor.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE VISIT NEW HAMPSHIRE

I am happy that nine members of the Public Works Committee visited New Hampshire from August 28 to September 1, 1953. The mission, headed by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, made a thorough inspection of the harbor and the river. The Members also visited Rye Harbor, Hampton Harbor, and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. It is significant that for the first time in the history of the Granite State Members of Congress who are dealing with harbor and erosion problems have acquired a complete picture of all the problems connected with the New Hampshire harbors and coastline.

On May 26 the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors approved an authorization of $952,000 for Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River to be included in this bill we are considering today. I am more than pleased that the full committee on June 11 included this in H. R. 9859, which is now before us for action.

INDUSTRIAL FUTURE

The extent of the economic and industrial development as a result of such improvements will be boundless. The clearing of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River will be one of the greatest boons to economic growth New Hampshire has ever experienced. We are now in sight of the long-needed and long-overdue harbor and river improvements.

HAMPTON BEACH AND HAMPTON HARBOR BEACH EROSION

Hampton Beach is one of New Hampshire's greatest assets. Prior to 1935 Hampton Beach was subject to grave erosion and considerable property damage due to the fluctuation of the inlet to Hampton Harbor. In 1932 the beach erosion board made a report which resulted in 1935 in the building of jetties by the State of New Hampshire. Sand was pumped from the harbor and about 50 acres of land were reclaimed. In 1942, as a result of a further erosion study, the State constructed a seawall.

On many occasions I have inspected the beach and have been much alarmed by the constant erosion. It is disturbing to see one of New Hampshire's greatest assets being washed away. I have constantly sought action to correct this situation.

In a letter to me dated August 14, 1952, Col. L. H. Hewitt, of the division of engineers, stated:

> I have just received word from the Office of the Chief of Engineers that the New England division is authorized to proceed with the cooperative beach erosion study at Hampton Beach, N. H., which was suspended under Presidential directive dated July 21, 1950, as an economy measure.

STATE ACTION

This cooperative beach erosion study proceeded and in October 1953 it was submitted by the New England division for action by the Congress. The report recommends widening 1 mile of beach by 150 feet and the northerly quarter mile by an additional 25 feet. This would require 340,000 cubic yards of sand. The sand is available in the harbor lying immediately south of the beach. This project is to cost $420,000 and the Federal participation, which is one-third, is $140,000. I am glad that this is included in this bill.

In the 1953 session of the State legislature, New Hampshire authorized $1,275,000 to carry on a program for the improvement of the shore at Hampton. The State proposes to extend the seawall and to improve the shore north and south of Great Boar's Head. The Federal grant is extremely important. The area is a vital unit in the economy of the State. Business at Hampton Beach totals approximately $10 million annually.

ADOPTION OF EROSION PROJECT

On April 7, 1954, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors held a hearing on the erosion project, and on May 26, 1954, approved the project. On June 15, 1954, the full committee included the project in the bill we are considering today.

Early in 1949 I requested the Public Works Committee of the House to review the reports on Hampton Beach and Hampton Harbor. On June 2, 1949, the committee passed the following resolution:

> *Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States,* That the Board of Engineers

for Rivers and Harbors be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on Hampton River and Harbor, N. H., submitted in House Document No. 247, 58th Congress, 2d session, and subsequent reports with a view to determining whether the provision of anchorage basins and channel and other improvements for navigation is advisable at this time.

Although the above resolution is still pending, the Corps of Engineers under the provisions of section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, which was approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, made a study of Hampton Beach as I have just described.

I have already pointed out that the sand to be used for the beach will be taken from the harbor. Therefore, as soon as the authorization of $140,000 is completed by the Congress and the appropriation is made, not only will the erosion work be carried out, but the harbor will be dredged.

IMPORTANCE OF BEACH EROSION PROJECT

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of this work. The town of Hampton has a population of nearly 3,000, but within a radius of 50 miles there are 2,350,000. This is a most popular area. Hampton Beach and Hampton Harbor form the center of the recreational needs for thousands of people. Therefore, the improvements about which I have been speaking will affect in a very material way the economy of the entire area.

CONCLUSION

The people of my district are exceedingly happy that these two projects have been included in this bill. I take this opportunity to thank the committee for the consideration they have given New Hampshire and I am more than pleased that so much progress had been made toward the accomplishment of these long-range improvements which will mean so much to the economy of the Granite State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to pay my respects to each and every member of this committee. However, I cannot go along with them in respect to all of the legislation they have submitted.

I observe that almost all States in the Union are pretty well taken care of by way of projects of various kinds. I understand 41 States are included in this proposal. I want to ask the chairman of this committee, whether or not this bill will cost almost a billion dollars, so when you pass the bill you are going to obligate our country by almost one billion dollars in additional charges—$897 million is the amount I read in your report.

I also direct your attention to the fact that our country is charged with projects amounting to some ten billion dollars, according to the figures I have before me. I regret I do not have all the information, because with all that is said about this, copies of hearings on flood control are not available.

I would like to know, however, how many projects there are already authorized but not completed. Can any member of the committee give me that information?

Mr. DONDERO. They amount to some $10 million.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman know the number of them?

Mr. DONDERO. No; I do not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am getting at is, why should we go ahead and authorize billions of dollars on new projects when we have not already started on projects that have been authorized. If these projects authorized in this bill are more imminent or more important, then such showing should be made. In other words, if these, or any of them, should have priority then why not indicate it. It is probable that some of the projects ought to have immediate attention. If such is true then set them out so they must have first attention. Furthermore, many of these projects are to provide complete flood protection or to furnish water supply for cities and towns at the expense of the Government. What do cities and towns who furnish a part, or all, of the funds for water supply think about that? These are two items, in my opinion, should be eliminated from this bill. They are described as the Pomona Reservoir and the Melvern Reservoir, and are, if built, to be located in Osage County, Kans.

They are at the head of a series of nine dams, or reservoirs, on a comparatively small river. It is the Marais des Cygnes River in Kansas. Then it is the Osage River in Missouri.

Let me make this quite clear. This is not a part of the Kaw or Kansas River. It does not flow into the Missouri River near Kansas City. It has nothing to do with the Kansas City flood you hear so much about. It flows into the Missouri River near Jefferson City. It will be said that these projects should be built to prevent a disaster—if there is a disaster—similar to that of 1951. Army engineers have testified, in event of a repetition of that catastrophe, neither of the proposed dams, or both of them, would protect the city from damaging floods. How could they, when they are full or nearly full of water, if and when such flood could come.

I do agree the reservoir at Melvern would furnish a good supply of water for the city right below the dam.

It would lend some Government protection to property owners, protection at the expense of owners of lands and homes that would be put under water by reason of this legislation.

There is a program of watersheds going on, whereby they are working on the problem of holding the water where it falls. They are working on the problem of putting in a series of small dams on this river or creek, and it would save the expenditure of tremendous amounts of money; and would save not only the expenditure of money but thousands of acres of good productive land that would be put under water.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize my distinguished friend from just east of our district, who represents the town of Ottawa, is in favor of this because it will protect the city of Ottawa. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States will supply funds in the sum of $26 million if this dam is completed, and it will provide 2 things for that city. It will provide water supply and possibly it will help the control of floods in some degree. The gentleman and I differ a little on that, because I think there is another way of taking care of the flood-control situation in the town he describes.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. First I would like to ask the gentleman if he favors the projects on the Marias des Cygnes River.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not at this time. At least not while there is a watershed program underway.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Which will protect his hometown of Emporia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Emporia is not on the Marias des Cygnes River.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would also like to ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the Marais des Cygnes Valley about which we are talking is not a valley where you have a flood just once in a while but a valley where we have floods almost every year and that will happen almost any minute of the year and do tremendous damage clear down the stream.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I don't think the floods are as frequent as the gentleman describes. If he is talking about flash floods then it is difficult for any dams to stop them.

I do think, as a matter of fairness, these people—hundreds of them—ought to be given a chance to go ahead with their watershed plans whereby they can protect their soil, catch most of the rain where it falls, and hold the surplus in comparatively small reservoirs rather than do it in this way. The thing that impresses me is the efforts the property owners are making in dealing with this problem. Out of respect to these people, the least you should do is to give them a chance to develop these plans under legislation recently approved by this Congress, sponsored by the House Committee on Agriculture. Do not forget you are disturbing the homes and lives of thousands of good American citizens if you put this legislation into effect. Let me repeat. I am not talking about other projects. I am talking about a situation different from others.

One thing more. I do not believe the testimony is overwhelming that the plan is economically sound. Of course, it will make land below the dam more valuable. Is that the complete answer?

I suggest we withhold the spending of $50 million until these home owners have been given a chance to try to work this problem out. Let me remind you once more that 4,000 American citizens who would be affected, are asking you not to authorize this legislation at the present time. The thing I want the Members to understand is that while these people are now putting in a water-

shed plan, we can let this thing go over for a year or two, and give them a chance.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have been waiting for 25 years. The gentleman talks about 4,000 signers on a petition. I will show him 12,000 signers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, because they get all the benefits and do not have to pay anything for such benefits. I understand that. But here are people whose land will be used and those people will be damaged if you approve this legislation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They will be paid, but when we lose it we pay for it ourselves.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not think the Government ought to pay all of those benefits. If the gentleman believes the Government should pay for all of these things, I cannot agree with him.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I take this time primarily to explain an amendment to the bill that I intend to offer when the bill is read for amendment. The amendment I propose would not be brought to the floor at this time if we had had an opportunity to act upon it in committee, but by agreement in committee it was decided to hold this amendment out until we came to the floor because at the time we did not have a complete report. As a matter of fact, we do not have one yet in regard to it. So I think it is time to pass upon the proposition.

Mr. Chairman, the many reservoirs that have been built over the country by the Corps of Engineers in the last 20 years or so have been one of the greatest recreational assets that the United States today enjoys. May I point out that last year 51 million people visited these various reservoirs over the United States for hunting, fishing, boating, and other types of recreation which are available at a lake. Most of these lakes, these man-made lakes, that have been constructed at public expense, primarily, of course, for flood-control purposes, are in areas where there never has been this type of recreational facilities before. The people have learned to enjoy them and receive a great deal of benefit from these areas. I know something about this personally because we have three such lakes built in northern Mississippi where I happen to live, and I know how greatly the people in that area make use of these lakes for hunting and fishing.

Under the policy that has been established by the Corps of Engineers in the past the land around the lakes has been made available for rent or lease at nominal sums to various States and to various local nonprofit organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the 4-H Clubs, and so forth, to organize camps and to make use of the area for recreational purposes. A good part of the area is leased to commercial operators who rent cabins and various fishing and hunting equipment, or sell it in order to give the public greater access to these recreational areas.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, 51 million people during the past year made use of this great recreational opportunity that has been made possible to the people of the country as a byproduct of our flood-control program. All of the reservoirs that are authorized under this bill were studied and surveyed and reported to the Congress under the procedure which provided for certain acquisition that made recreational development possible.

NEW LAND POLICY

However, last fall the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior, the two agencies of the Government that manage the great reservoirs of our country, announced the adoption of a new land-acquisition policy which was designed for good purposes, I am sure, but which would have the effect, if it is allowed to continue without at least some indication of the sense of the Congress in this regard, of making impossible the future recreational development of these reservoirs as they have in the past. This new policy makes it impossible for the Corps of Engineers, in the case of the reservoirs authorized under this bill, to acquire land in a manner that will make possible these various State and local parks that have been established in the past, and the various access areas for the general public for fishing and hunting in these reservoir projects. The main difference is that the new policy provides that the Government shall buy floodway easements instead of buying outright title to certain land adjacent to a conservation pool. I am reliably informed by the people who do this work or who have watched it being done over a long period of years that there will be virtually no difference in the cost, and that is readily understandable. Certainly no farmer is going to sell a floodway easement on his property for any vast difference in amount of cost than he would to sell the land outright, because it is subject to flooding at all times under the floodway easement, without any recovery of damages to crops or property or anything like that, and land like that, of course, could never be sold in the future for any amount worthy of any price. I am told in the areas that I am familiar with that the difference in cost would perhaps not be as much as 5 percent. Perhaps it would be as little as 1 percent in those matters. What I strive to do in the amendment that I shall introduce is to provide on a very permissive basis that land to be acquired to build the reservoirs authorized under this act, under the flood-control title of this act, shall be acquired in such a manner as to facilitate the potential development of recreational uses of the reservoir by Federal, State, or local authorities, whenever such recreational development would not interfere with the basic purposes of the reservoir.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed upon when it is offered at the time the bill is read for amendment, because I am certain it is not the sense of this Congress that it would desire these new manmade lakes which are being built under the authorization of this bill to be constructed in such a manner that the general public would be denied proper access for the recreational use of these lakes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Flood Control for their diligent attendance at all meeting of the committee. Also I thank them for their active participation in the hearings on these projects.

In behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, I, in compliance with his request, thank the members of his subcommittee for their diligence and interest during the consideration of the rivers and harbors section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, I am happy to recommend this bill to the Members of the House. It is, in my opinion, a good bill.

More hours of study and research, I think, were devoted by members of the Public Works Committee to the preparation of this bill than to any river-and-harbor and flood-control measure ever reported by the committee. Every project in the bill has been scrutinized with the greatest care. I do not believe there is anything in the bill that should not be there.

Every project in this bill has the approval of the United States Army engineers of the district and division in which the proposed project originated.

When the district and divisional engineers approve a river-and-harbor or flood-control project their favorable report is sent to the Board of Army Engineers here in Washington for review and reexamination. This Board of Review, composed of the ablest and most experienced division engineers of the Nation, reexamined the project. Every project in this bill has been reexamined by this distinguished Board of Army Engineers and has this Review Board's approval.

Every project in this bill has been reviewed and approved by the Secretary of the Army.

Every project in this bill has been approved by the governor of the State in which it will be constructed.

With a very few exceptions, all projects in this bill have the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or of the Committee on Flood Control, whichever held the hearings on the project. In a few cases projects were included in the bill where one or two members voted against the project. In these few cases, however, a large majority of our committee favored the projects.

Every project upon which hearings were held which is not included in this bill was left out by the unanimous or practically unanimous approval of the committee.

Every project that was modified by reducing the monetary authorization asked by the Army engineers was so reduced by the unanimous vote of the committee.

In short, this bill as finally written expressed the almost unanimous view of the committee and is just about the nearest approach to complete agreement that anyone could expect on a bill of this magnitude and complexity.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS HIGH

There is no project in this bill that does not have a benefit cost ratio of better than unity—that is, of $1 of benefit a year for each dollar of annual cost as computed by the Corps of United States Army Engineers. In many cases the benefits are better, $2 to $3 to each $1 of cost and in some as high as $6 a year in benefits to each $1 of annual cost.

The dollars spent on the flood-control projects in this bill should not be considered as expenditures but rather as investments which will pay for themselves within a period of years.

America's great source of strength is her matchless productive machine which has demonstrated that it can, in peace or war, outproduce the world. One reason for the strength of that productive machine is our best-in-the-world transportation system, which enables us to get raw material to factories and finished goods to consumers quickly and cheaply.

Despite the developments in air, railroad, and motor transportation, waterways do now, as since the beginning of civilization, provide the lowest cost transportation for bulk cargoes. We must keep our rivers and harbors, which are the highways for low-cost cargo shipments, in good condition in order that freight charges may be kept low. Whatever reduces transportation costs in the end reduces consumer prices.

It is of historic interest to note that nearly all great industrial cities always have been established where low-cost water transportation has been available.

The world's first great cities, when boats were frail, developed in river valleys, such as the Nile and Euphrates.

Later when boats became larger, great cities developed on the inland seas such as the Mediterranean. Then Carthage, Rome, and Athens came into their glory. Afterward, when vessels became seaworthy, industry and civilization moved to the oceans and seacoasts and thenceforth until now the great population centers are on ports where rail and water transportation meet.

It is interesting to note that in our own country, not until we reach our 16th city in size, Indianapolis, Ind., do we find a big city that is not an ocean, a lake, or a river port.

The great river systems of America, for the most part and at most times, have been kind to the American people. However, these rivers do have a Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde character and do suffer periods of madness when they run amuck leaving death, destruction, and disaster in their wake.

Since 1936, when the first general flood-control act was passed, Congress has been trying to bring the river systems of the Nation under control.

Floods are not new in America. De Soto encountered them when he first, in 1541, visited the interior of our continent. New Englanders were building dikes to fight floods long before they built ramparts on Bunker Hill to fight the British. Southern farmers were constructing similar works to battle the oncoming waters of the Mississippi long before the Louisiana Purchase.

The floods of pioneer days, however, did little damage if damages be measured in dollars. The river valleys then were only sparsely settled. These valleys were not crowded, then, as they are today with cities, factories, office buildings, churches, schools, highways, bridges, railroads, and developed farmlands.

Even when early-day floods washed fertile farmlands downstream to the sea, pioneer farmers worried little for over the hill was more land, untouched by the plow, that could be had almost for the asking.

Times, however, have changed. Good idle farmland is scarce and becoming scarcer. The river valleys have become heavily populated and are becoming more so every year. Billions have been invested in the river valleys for buildings, highways, railroads, and those improvements which civilization requires. These investments are increasing year after year. The urgency of protecting the increasing number of valley residents and their mounting investments is growing and will continue to grow as long as the population continues to multiply and prosper.

The Corps of the United States Army Engineers has made studies during recent years which reveal that the average monetary loss which this Nation suffers from floods is about $500 million a year. Some years, such as 1936 when New England experienced a flood that did a half billion in damage and 1951 in which the billion-dollar flood occurred in the Missouri and Kaw basins, the damages have far exceeded the half-billion dollar average. In other favorable years the losses have been less. But on the average, say the Army engineers, the flood loss of the Nation is half a billion dollars a year.

These losses will tend to increase, rather than decrease, unless strong remedial works are undertaken.

Our Nation in 1900 had a population of less than 75 million. By 1950 our Nation's population had increased to more than 150 million. Our population will be 300 million by A. D. 2000.

Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the population of this Nation by A. D. 2000 will double. It probably will be 300 million then compared to half that number now.

The doubling of our Nation's population by the year A. D. 2000 will mean more people and more wealth in our river valleys to require flood protection.

The sooner Congress provides that protection the less it will cost since nearly all protective works demand land acquisition, and land values increase in ratio with population growth.

Flood control in America was once a small and simple problem. The expanding populations and growing wealth of our Nation's river valleys have made it a complex and gigantic one.

It was not until 1936 that Congress, after years of urging recognized flood control as a national welfare responsibility of the Federal Government and made it so in the Flood Control Act of 1936.

In the 18 years which have elapsed since the enactment of that first flood-control bill, the Congress has authorized the construction of 909 flood-control projects. These 909 Federal flood-control projects if all constructed at today's prices would require the expenditure of $6,736,000,000 of Federal funds.

Of this huge sum $2,286,000,000 already has been appropriated, leaving nearly $5 billion still to to be appropriated before these 909 authorized projects can be completed.

Nor will the completion of these 909 authorized projects finish the Nation's flood-control problems for there are today 446 proposed flood-control projects not yet authorized that are in the study mill of the United States Army Engineers. Most of these, eventually, will come to the Congress for authorizations.

Three years ago the Jones committee of which our friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], was chairman, did an excellent job studying the Nation's water problems. Among facts developed by the Jones committee was one which showed that the backlog of authorized river and harbor flood-control projects at that time was $10 billion.

Since then, the Congress have appropriated $1½ billion for river and harbor and flood-control works. This has reduced the backlog to $8½ billion. Also, the Corps of United States Army Engineers has prepared a list of projects, estimated to cost $2 billion, and placed these projects on a deferred list. This has reduced the backlog to about $6½ billion now. When this bill is passed the backlog of authorized projects will be about $7½ billion.

I am not alarmed by this backlog. I think this backlog a good thing. We should have a great many thoroughly investigated worthy projects ready for instant use if and when a recession or depression should occur.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to get this clear: After the Congress authorized this $10 billion, did the Army engineers shove $2 billion of it aside?

Mr. MACK of Washington. No. They have taken $2 billion of projects and placed them on an inactive list. Projects on the inactive list will not be considered until all other projects have been undertaken.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But they are still authorized?

Mr. MACK of Washington. They are still authorized, but they are on the inactive list.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We did not strike them clear out?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Regarding the Little Sioux project in Iowa, I note the committee has approved an additional authorization of $10,076,000 for that project, which is in addition to the original

authorization in 1948, I believe. The original project was estimated by the Army engineers to cost $5,390,000. As I understand, the purpose of the committee was to bring the total authorization on that project up to the request of the Army engineers of $15,466,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this, the gentleman who now has the floor, if my assumption is correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct. The Army engineers requested $15,466,000. The committee cut down their request for an appropriation but specified they were to use the money unexpended in the old authorization to make up the difference. In effect you get the full amount as requested by the Army engineers to fully complete and develop the project as recommended in the report of the Army engineers.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I, too, want to pay a compliment to the two subcommittees and the full committee, possibly, for the hard work they have done on this particular legislation. Though a member of the Committee on Public Works, it is not my privilege to sit on either the Subcommittee on Flood Control or the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors; however, I know the members of those subcommittees have put in a great deal of hard work.

May I ask the distinguished chairman if he will explain to the committee this language appearing on page 39, line 25:

> That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as required, from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations.

And so forth. In other words, in this legislation are we giving a blank check to the Army engineers to establish where and when they want to this network of stations without any further consideration relative to the cost?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the chairman of the full committee desire to answer that question, or does he desire I do so?

Mr. DONDERO. That is a matter of cooperation between the Army engineers and the Weather Bureau in establishing stations throughout the country. No, it does not. It is simply carrying on the practice and custom that has heretofore obtained. By doing this, it is really a matter of economy and cutting down the cost.

Mr. McGREGOR. In line 25 it says, "That there is hereby authorized an expenditure." We have no idea what that expenditure is going to be. Is that correct? It is a blanket authorization, with no dollars and cents established by an authorization as such.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army engineers have greatly expanded their programs of flood control. Of course, they must have weather reports in order to carry out these flood-control projects effectively. Up to the present time the Army engineers have been expending about $375,000 a year to finance these weather reports from the Weather Bureau. The Engineers figure they should pay the Weather Bureau more than that. It is estimated that perhaps the cost will be as much as $1 million a year.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not possible to put a limit on the amount of money they can spend? You are giving them an unlimited authorization here.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee felt that the Army engineers would not waste this money since it is money that is allocated for the construction of projects, that will be used to secure these weather reports. We think the engineers will use the money judiciously because they are not going to turn any more money over to the Weather Bureau than they feel they have to have.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe that is fully explained on page 157 of the report. The amount of money that has been involved is $375,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. I agree with the distinguished chairman that it is in the report, but in the bill that we are going to pass and which will become law, you are giving a blank check for it.

Mr. JENSEN. The Army engineers are limited on each project as to the amount of money that can be spent on the projects. When the Congress appropriates for these projects, whatever the Army engineers would spend for weather reports would have to be taken out of the amount of money which the Congress appropriates for the projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. So there is a limitation.

Mr. McGREGOR. But I still call to your attention the fact that you are amending the Flood Control Act of 1938, which you referred to, and giving an authorization for the expenditure of an unknown amount of money for these weather projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I think the gentleman from Iowa is correct. I do not believe the Army engineers are going to waste $1 million by taking it away from constructive projects and needlessly paying it over to another agency of the Government, namely, the Weather Bureau.

Mr. DONDERO. The explanation is on page 40 of the bill. The explanation is in the legislation. With reference to the amount which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] refers to as being a blank check, you will notice that the bill reads "from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control on rivers and harbors." In other words, they can switch the amount they need from one agency to the other, whichever seems most desirable and in the interest of economy.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is the part I am objecting to, because you are giving the Army engineers an opportunity and the right to take money from an appropriation which might be used for dredging and put it into a Weather Bureau program. That is the part I am objecting to.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, no cost figures are available on the magnitude of the Nation's water resources development problems. My guess is—and I consider it a most conservative one—that it will require the expenditure of $20 billion to assure full protection of our river valleys from floods and to assure that the waters of our rivers will be used to the best advantage for the related purposes of navigation, reclamation, irrigation, recreation, and power production.

The taxpayers will pay for these water development projects whether these are built or not. If these flood control, and other water development projects, are built, our citizens will pay for them in taxes. If these projects are not built, the taxpayers will pay for them just the same, in the half billion dollars a year they will be compelled to spend to repair the damages of the floods which will repeatedly occur if protection works are not provided; in the loss of the use of low-cost power and in higher transportation costs of freight for which low-cost water transportation is not made available.

Since it will cost less to build these water development projects now than later when population growth has swollen land values, we of the Congress should move forward to providing funds for protective works as rapidly as the budgetary reduction of the Nation permits.

Flood-control measures save property from damage and destruction. The money spent on flood control is repaid by the saving of property from destruction.

The money spent on flood-control projects is not all outgo. Many of the flood-control projects are multiple purpose ones. Some of these projects in addition to preventing flood damage generate hydroelectric power. These power revenues often go a long way toward helping to pay the cost of building a flood-control reservoir or dam. For example, it is figured that the flood-control Dalles Dam, when completed, will return to the Federal Government, at present rates, $11,800,000 a year in power revenue.

The Bonneville Power Administration, which markets the power from Federal dams on the Columbia River, during the past year paid into the Federal Treasury more than $50 million. This $50 million was more than enough to pay all of the operating and maintenance expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration, with enough left over to return to the Federal Government all of the money our Government has invested in Columbia River flood control and power dams, plus interest on the money.

The great flood control and power dams have created behind them great lakes which have added much in many regions to the recreational enjoyments of the people.

Also, in many cases these dams have helped to provide the people in populous cities with a better and more wholesome supply of domestic water.

Despite our zeal for river and harbor and flood-control improvements, we,

Congressmen, must ever keep in mind that we must maintain the Nation's strong national financial and economic system by guarding it against the inflation that results from overly large deficit spending and a national debt that is too colossal. It is, therefore, necessary that we first economize in some places that we may expand our spending efforts in other and more worthwhile ones.

President Eisenhower has been doing a great job of eliminating waste and extravagance from Government. As his program for economy and efficiency in Government goes forward there will be more money for two things: First, for tax reduction to the people; and second, for undertaking and expanding programs for such worthwhile and necessary improvement of lasting benefit such as the building of more, better, and safer highways and more river and harbor, flood control, and water resources development works.

Solution of the Nation's water problems, its flood control, navigation, power-dam building, reclamation, and irrigation is a gigantic undertaking that will cost at a most conservative estimate at least $20 billion.

It is not wise that our citizens should expect and depend solely upon Uncle Sam, alone, to do it all. We should approve and applaud, therefore, the President's proposal for partnership development of the water resources.

Our highways today are being built under a partnership arrangement between the States and the Federal Government. It is just as desirable that our water resources developments should go forward with the States and local communities assisting wherever they can. Projects will go forward much faster under partnership than by expecting Uncle Sam, alone, to do it all.

The Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported favorably and the House already has passed two important flood-control bills which will permit 2 State publicly owned Oregon-Washington utilities to build 2 hydroelectric dams in the Pacific Northwest. The building of these dams under the partnership arrangement will free more than $350 million of Federal money for use on other water developments.

One thing the Congress should guard against in building these huge water development projects is the taking of unnecessarily large blocks of land into Federal ownership and off the local tax rolls of States and their subdivisions.

For example, at the Falcom Dam in Texas the Government bought 47,000 acres of land above the highest point to which water behind the dam would ever rise. This 47,000 acres was to be used for recreational purposes. While almost everyone is for recreation, the taking of 47,000 acres at this one location for recreation was an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money. That much land never will be needed there for recreation.

In most cases the Federal Government, except in the national park field, should not be in the recreation business and acquire large land holdings for that purpose. The recreation field usually is one for the States. The States are in far better position to say how much land is required for recreational purpose than is the faraway Government here in Washington.

Everywhere throughout the Nation the Federal Government is holding many small parcels of land for which it no longer has any use. These should be sold to the States, subdivisions of the States, or to private citizens and thereby put to useful purposes and gotten back onto the tax rolls.

Instead of constantly increasing its land holding the Federal Government should be reducing these holdings.

Of the entire land area of all the 48 States in the Union, 23.89 percent is owned, controlled, managed, and administered by the Federal Government. The land owned by the Federal Government in the 48 States, if consolidated into one block, would be sufficient to create a State 2½ times the size of Texas or 10 times the size of the State of Washington.

The total land area of these 48 States is 2,977,138 square miles. Of this, the Federal Government owns 711,166 square miles, or 455,146,725 acres. These Federal land holdings are the equivalent of more than 3 acres for every man, woman, and child who live in the United States. And these figures, mind you, do not include the additional enormous land holdings of the Federal Government in Alaska, Hawaii, and elsewhere outside continental United States.

Of the entire area of the 10 Western States, 54.31 percent, or considerably more than one-half, is federally owned. Under leave, I include a table showing the land area, in acres, of each of the 10 Western States, the number of these acres which are owned by the Federal Government, and the percentage of the State's whole acreage that this Federal ownership comprises.

Federal landownership

	Total land area of State	Acreage in Federal ownership	Percentage of Federal ownership
Washington	42, 865, 280	14, 998, 067	34. 99
Oregon	61, 664, 000	32, 510, 870	52. 72
California	100, 353, 920	45, 900, 157	45. 74
Arizona	72, 691, 200	50, 471, 920	69. 43
New Mexico	77, 767, 040	35, 479, 713	45. 62
Nevada	70, 273, 280	59, 526, 959	84. 71
Idaho	52, 997, 120	34, 285, 000	64. 69
Montana	93, 642, 240	34, 213, 875	36. 54
Utah	52, 701, 440	37, 592, 044	71. 33
Colorado	66, 538, 880	24, 851, 005	37. 35

There are 149 projects in this bill. These projects are in 41 States and 2 Territories. Every one of them has the approval of this committee.

Some projects upon which the committee held hearings were rejected, most of them by a unanimous or almost unanimous vote.

One project involved flood-control protection for a golf course. It was a municipal golf course. The committee, however, felt that we should not spend taxpayers' money on projects of this kind. The committee held it was not a Federal responsibility to provide flood protection for a municipal golf course.

Several other projects were rejected by the committee because the cost of protecting the land was too great compared to the value of the land.

Although the bill has in it 149 projects the total amount of money authorizations involved is less than $900 million. It will be 2 years before another bill of this kind is enacted.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the committee on the proposed bill. I think it is one that was very thoroughly considered and very well worked out. I am particularly pleased that the committee has authorized the necessary funds to prevent what, in my opinion, would be a major disaster to our Nation, and that is the diversion of the Mississippi River into a new channel whereby it would flow to the Gulf of Mexico in a way different from that which it now flows.

The committee, in its wisdom, recognizing the vital national significance of keeping the Mississippi River where it is, has made the necessary authorization, and I am quite sure that this means that Ol' Man River will keep on flowing past New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico.

I should like particularly to address my remarks to that section of the bill providing for the authorization of approximately $47 million for the erection of control structures and other works to prevent the diversion of the Mississippi River at Old River in Louisiana.

It is vital that the work begin on this project as soon as practicable. Failure to adopt this authorization and later to appropriate the necessary funds would be a disaster of the first order.

This is a matter of the most extreme urgency. It is not only absolutely necessary that something be done; it is imperative that it be done, or at least that it be commenced immediately.

Each year more and more of the water of the Mississippi River is being diverted through Old River into the Atchafalaya River. In 1919, the percentage of this diversion was 17.1 percent. By 1950, it had reached 30 percent. The best and most reliable estimates are that it will reach 40 percent before 1965. If this should come to pass, we will have waited too long, because when this point is reached, nothing can be done. The history of diversions from one channel to another teaches us that as the rate increases the speed increases. The channel widens and deepens at such a terrific rate that it eventually becomes impossible to reverse the flow. This is the considered opinion of sound, level-headed engineers who speak from actual experience.

Old River has doubled in size since 1894 and, since 1942, its flow has been into the Atchafalaya exclusively instead of back and forth between the Atchafalaya and the Mississippi, as was the case in former years. If this steady diversion is allowed to continue uninterrupted much longer, the Atchafalaya will capture the Mississippi and no power on earth will be able to prevent it.

Now this does not mean that there will be 2 channels, with 1 going this way and the other that. The inexorable laws of nature operate in a different way from this. Instead of a fork, there will be a complete cutoff. Eddys will be

built up by the swirling waters and silt deposited in the old channel until eventually a natural dam will have been built and all the water that formerly flowed down the Mississippi will be carried by the Atchafalaya with consequences almost too appalling to contemplate.

The fact that this hour is only now upon us is due to the fact that nature has been kind to us in recent years and no unusual circumstances have intervened to increase our peril. But let a series of floods occur and the diversion we contemplate will occur by 1965 may take place much sooner. We will then find ourselves in the frustrating position, after having spent hundreds of millions of dollars for flood control, of having allowed a disaster of the most devastating magnitude to develop while we debated the advisability of taking this obviously necessary precautionary measure.

Scores of major industrial facilities line the banks of the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico. Included among these are the largest complete products oil refinery in the world and the greatest aluminum-production facility in America. Five oil refineries process a total of 340,000 barrels of crude oil a day, and on the lower Mississippi River giant sulfur works supply the basic ingredient of that most important product, sulfuric acid, a commodity so vital to our civilization that it has been said that a nation's industrial progress can be measured by its consumption. It is agreed, incidentally, that without these sulfur deposits on the Mississippi River and the means of making them produce America would face a most critical sulfur shortage.

In addition to oil refineries, aluminum plants, and sulfur works, there are match factories, chemical plants, cordage works, sugar houses, and ammunition facilities. There are plants that produce rubber, building materials, asbestos shingles, plumbing fixtures, board and plywood products, yeast, and tank engines. There are steel mills, cement plants, powerhouses, and other industries too numerous to mention, and they have all one basic requirement in common. They all need vast amounts of fresh water to operate. At present they are getting their water from the Mississippi, but what will happen when the Mississippi River becomes a salt-water arm of the Gulf of Mexico? I sincerely hope we never find out.

Tremendous as they are, the things that I have mentioned are only a few of the consequences that would follow a change of course by the Mississippi River. They are in themselves, however, certainly sufficient to convince anyone that this terrible thing must not happen.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for this time for the purpose of opposing this legislation. My record in the Congress has been in support of flood-control programs. I certainly have no intention of saying anything that would add to the apparent civil war in Kansas.

In looking over these projects, I notice there are projects in 41 of the 48 States, but West Virginia happens to be 1 of the 7 States not included. That is due to the fact that West Virginia did not ask for any more authorizations. We were active right after the authorization by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1938 in trying to get some of these projects, then authorized, activated.

In 1946, my first year in the Congress of the United States, we received an initial appropriation for the Sutton Reservoir. That is what I want to take time to advise my colleagues about this afternoon.

The Army engineers have an ambitious program for the control of floods. Since the Ohio River is one in which we have considerable rainfall, it is one in which they are conducting an ambitious program for flood control. In laying out the plan for the control of the great Kanawha River, which is one of the larger tributaries of the Ohio River, they designated four major projects in the State of West Virginia. Two or 3 years ago we finished construction of the famous Bluestone Dam on the New River in West Virginia. That is 1 of the 4 projects to control that watershed.

The second project is the reservoir at Sutton, W. Va., on the Elk River. The third project is at Sommerville on the Gauley River, and the fourth one is at Big Bend on the Greenbriar, all tributaries of the Ohio River.

This Sutton project was initially authorized in 1946 in an initial appropriation of $750,000. There have been additional appropriations to a total of $3,100,000. We have acquired title to most of the property that will be flooded by this reservoir. We have relocated approximately 4½ miles of the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. There are approximately 3 miles more of the railroad to be relocated. We had everything ready to start construction in 1951 and there was $1,300,000 of construction money appropriated. The Korean trouble came on and President Truman froze this $1,300,000 in the defense effort, on the ground that possibly we could not sustain a claim that this project was in the interest of national defense.

Despite the action of the President, the Army engineers in approving this project said that if we had one flood similar to the one we have had in the last 50 years in this valley, it would do $20 million worth of damage to the Carbide & Carbon Co. installation on Blaine Island, where this project on Elk River is located, joins the great Kanawha River at the city of Charleston.

Just last Tuesday a group of businessmen from Charleston came to Washington and we had a conference with the Budget Office with reference to this particular project. Here is the main reason why there is a possibility that work can be resumed on this project. On the Elk River, on which this big reservoir is located, are located two eastern termini of the Big Inch pipeline. The John Cornwall station of the Hope Gas Co., and the Cobb station of the United Fuel & Gas. They are compressor stations that force gas to Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, and all points in the East. Within the last 20 years there have been floods that have damaged this John Cornwall station in the amount of $6 million.

I am asking my colleagues of the Congress to imagine what situation would exist if we do not go ahead and construct this reservoir and afford flood protection to those two great compressor stations. What is going to happen to the distribution of natural gas in all the eastern section of the country if there is a flood?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. If this reservoir is not constructed, you will have at the mercy of the elements those two great facilities that supply fuel to the greater part of the eastern United States. They are both in the flood area, and the representatives of the companies concerned were before the Budget Bureau in an effort to get an appropriation for the project. We are hopeful that action can be had. If I were going to offer any objection to this legislation, it would be to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] when he said that the Army engineers had adopted a new policy of shoving back and putting on the shelf a lot of projects that had already been authorized in favor of certain of these new projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army engineers have made a list of projects that will be the last ones they will recommend to the Bureau of the Budget to be put on the back shelf. These are not pressing and important projects. They have submitted a list of these projects to the Public Works Committee showing which ones are on the back shelf.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will agree with me that a project like the reservoir of which I am talking that has to do with the fuel supply of one-fourth of the Nation is not going to be shoved on a back shelf in favor of one of the new projects in this bill?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not think so. The gentleman's project will be eligible for an appropriation any time he can sell the Appropriations Committee on the idea that money should be appropriated to start his project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H. R. 9859.

For the first time in my nearly 18 years in Congress the House is acting on an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill in which the Third District of Michigan has a direct interest.

The proposed authorization of a flood-control project on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Mich., undertakes to bring to fruition 7 years of joint effort and study by the Army Corps of Engineers, the city of Battle Creek, and the State of Michigan. This proposed authorization offers prospect of solution of

a flood problem of more than 50 years' duration, and, at the same time, provides the key to solution of other related community problems, including a major railroad-consolidation project.

I will not attempt to detail the facts or anticipated costs or savings incident to this flood-control program. They have been exhaustively summarized by the Corps of Engineers, and as exhaustively reviewed by the Public Works Subcommittee and the full committee.

I will mention only one fact, namely, that under this project the city of Battle Creek will assume 44 percent of the total cost of the program. This is an exceptionally high proportion of local participation and support and is striking evidence of the good faith of the community and of the earnest desire of the city to meet and solve a very serious flood-control problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would be completely remiss if I failed to acknowledge the painstaking and highly competent work of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], and the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The caliber of the work done by these agencies of the executive branch and the committees of the Congress in respect to the project in which I have a special interest, and of which I therefore have a special awareness, has, I am sure, characterized their activities in respect to the other aspects of this omnibus bill. That is the best recommendation I know for approval of this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my compliments to the gentlemen who headed the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee and the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House. We held very lengthy hearings and I might say that the membership of each of the subcommittees were diligent in their work and stayed on the job listening to the testimony that came before us in justification of the many projects which appear in this bill. The committee took a nonpartisan position throughout our hearings. Each project was judged upon its merits.

In this bill today we have authorizations for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects of great importance to the internal economy of our country. When you take into consideration the hundreds of millions of dollars the taxpayers of the United States have paid out in public works throughout the entire world during the past several years, I believe it is about time that we start paying attention to the internal improvements of our own country. For instance, the smaller harbors, which may seem to be of little importance to many, are of vital importance to the fishing industry of our country; fishermen must go to sea to procure an important food for our people and should have the facility of safe harbors.

Many of the harbor improvements will be of great importance to those who use pleasure-type craft. In the improvement of these small harbors we are adding to the financial wealth of our country. In the improvement of the large harbors we are providing for economical transportation. We have long since established a policy to improve farm-to-market roads. I consider safe harbors for fishermen fall in the same category.

Flood-control projects approved by our committee and included in this bill will eliminate many of the flood losses that have occurred in the past. If we can avoid floods by proper treatment practices, untold millions will be saved. The losses by erosion is destroying untold acres of fine soil which must be saved for posterity. This bill will open up an avenue for internal improvements. It will be of great benefit to the United States of America and will provide for the expenditure of tax money in our own country. I approve very thoroughly of the bill which we recommend to you today and trust it will be adopted.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the committee that this is a good bill, with two exceptions. There are a lot of committees that do not recommend these projects.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to this bill is in the interest of all the people of the United States. Included in this $73 million is an authorization for a dam at Perry, Kans., to cost $16,263,000 and inundate 14,120 acres. I realize it is very unusual for a Member of the Congress to oppose the expenditure of Federal funds in his district, but the conditions under which I do so are most unusual. I am opposing the construction of these dams because the people of my district, where they are to be located, are opposed to them. This in itself should be sufficient reason for the passage of the amendment. The basis of their opposition further strengthens their position. In a few words this is why the people are opposed to these dams:

They oppose them because they are convinced that they are impractical and uneconomical. They are impractical because they are improperly placed and because they are antiquated. Let me picture to you what these proposed dams are intended to do. They are intended to protect the people living on the banks of the Kansas River against floods. Now where do floods come from? Evidently they do not arise from the water that falls on the river channel and the narrow valleys across which these dams are built. These channels are only a few rods wide. If it rained 40 days and 40 nights, as in Noah's time, on these valleys alone, it would not produce a flood. The river channel would take care of it. No, these floods come from the plains, the fields, and the farms that drain into these river channels. These fields and farms must be flooded before the channel can be flooded.

What is a flood, anyway? Why a flood is water on the rampage—water out of control. It must arise out of excess rainfall that the ground cannot absorb as it falls. Now it will be agreed that so far as the purpose of these proposed dams is concerned, our only problem is to take care of this excess or runoff water. Let us take a look at this problem, and in order to get the best possible perspective let us suppose we were up in an airplane during a heavy rainstorm when these floodwaters are formed. Let us look down upon this little valley of the Delaware River, one of the rivers these people want to dam. It is an area of 922 square miles upon which this rain is falling, 3, 4, 5, or maybe 6 inches of rainfall within as many hours. Only 1 or 2 inches can possibly soak into the soil. The rest, under the pull of gravity, is rushing by the shortest, steepest route to the ravines, the creeks, the tributaries, and on toward the river channel on its way to the sea. The whole area is being flooded from the farms to the river channel. This river basin is one sheet of water.

Now, Mr. Chairman, plainly the only question is: What is the best method to control that sheet of water? Is it not the sensible thing to begin the remedy where the trouble begins? Does it make sense to permit these few inches of rainfall that are spread out over the fields to accumulate, multiply their force in the creeks and tributaries, and when it has been multiplied a thousandfold in the river channel to try to halt it there? Now, my colleagues, we have seen a flood in the making. That sheet of water that we see accumulating over that river basin of 922 square miles has the potentiality of doing a lot of good and a lot of harm. The part that sinks into the ground will produce crops and furnish water for wells and springs for the use of families and for livestock. The part that flows off is the part that causes us to worry. Left to nature it will rush toward the creeks, the rivers, and the sea by the shortest, swiftest route. Our problem is to direct its course, so to slow down its movement, as to minimize or even prevent any damage. This in recent years we have become able to do and with greatly accelerated speed we are doing it. This is our program of soil conservation and flood prevention.

It was the Congress of the United States that originated this program in the passage of the soil conservation and flood-prevention acts authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts in 1936, providing for the formation of pilot watershed projects in the 82d Congress and appropriating funds for this development in the first session of the 83d Congress, and for further and greatly increased development in this session.

Mr. Chairman, the program provided for by Congress is being rapidly put into operation and is proving effective beyond the expectations of its most ardent advocates. Mr. Chairman, here is a peculiar situation. In this very Delaware River Basin, where it is proposed to build this $16 million dam, are located two of the experimental pilot watersheds. One of them is now nearing completion. A few weeks ago we had a torrential rain over that entire area, nearly 4 inches in a few

hours. One dam was nearly completed and was one-half filled. It took 2½ days for the water to flow through the outlet. Had there been enough rainfall to fill the reservoir, it would have required 5½ days to drain the reservoir. Is it not plain that this system of slowing down the water where it falls and keeping it slowed down is the sensible way to prevent floods?

Bear in mind that this floodwater, unimpeded, does irreparable damage on every square rod of cultivated land before it even enters into the first ravine on its way to the sea. We must not let the water go unimpeded, carrying away our good soil, flooding our good creek bottoms, washing away our bridges, and then, after it has done all this great damage, try to stop it in the main channel. I hear it said that this plan is too complicated, will take too much time. The opposite is true. It would require years to build the proposed dams on the rivers. During all that time, the people living on the river channel will have no protection. By this watershed program every field that is terraced, every dam that is constructed, is just that much protection. The Kansas River Basin is peculiarly subject to flood conditions. For that reason it should receive special consideration. And it is receiving it. It has six pilot watersheds authorized by Congress that are now being developed. Others are only waiting until the Hope-Aiken watershed bill becomes a law. Within 12 months throughout this Nation there should be hundreds of detention dams on the drawing boards or under construction. In this program of upstream flood prevention, the landowners are assessed 50 percent of the cost, whereas in the river-channel big-dam program 100 percent is borne by the Federal Government.

These dams are different from the multiple-purpose structures of the West and must be considered in their true light. I support wholeheartedly the provisions of local protection works for the cities in the Kansas River Basin. This work should and must be constructed at the earliest possible moment. These cities must not be denied local dikes and levees, cutoffs, and the like. These devices are needed regardless of the manner of reducing the river flow. That is an item deserving of much consideration.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up the objection to construction of this dam at Perry, Kans., the only purpose stipulated by its proponents is to prevent floods below. Recent inventions have shown us a better way. Congress has authorized and implemented such a program. We do not need two diametrically opposed programs to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, there is yet another and very cogent reason why this Congress should not authorize this dam. This is known as the rivers and harbors bill. A few weeks ago there was held in this city the annual convention of the Rivers and Harbors Association. President Eisenhower was invited to address this convention. Listen to his words, and I quote:

> I have become convinced that before very long, America will almost unanimously look upon water as its single greatest resource.
>
> So when a project is proposed that seems to me to be unrelated to all of the necessities of a river valley or of a slope in which it is located, I am very cold and unsympathetic. I believe that we have got to get into the Continental Divide and say—from there on down to the sea, studying where each drop of water falls—what we are going to do with it until it reaches the sea. I believe that any lesser survey of our water resources, our water uses, and our water control, is completely piecemeal, and we should reject it.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time it is my intention to offer an amendment to strike authorization of Perry Dam from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee during this 83d Congress. Its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], heads of the subcommittees, and Members of both the majority and minority, guided by the technical findings and assistance of the efficient Corps of Engineers, have each contributed bounteously to the volume of information leading to the omnibus bill of 1954.

Extensive hearings during both sessions of this Congress, covering a hundred or more projects, have impressed me with the magnitude of the Government's potential obligations if present policies of spreading financial aid to innumerable communities, able to establish desirability for their local needs, is continued.

Stemming from the original Federal legislation establishing Government's jurisdiction over the ocean harbors and navigable streams, successive acts of the Congress have legalized Federal participation in navigation facilities, flood control works, hydro power installations, irrigation systems, and, in recent years, optional responsibility for soil and water conservation, beach erosion and recreational facilities.

There are few habitable areas of this country, either coastwise or inland, that cannot, with one or with a combination of the above federally accepted responsibilities, present convincing evidence to justify the need for corrective or remedial structural works.

During a 6-week's inspection tour last summer, we heard local stories and observed specific problems all over the country, ranging from small fishing villages to gigantic multipurpose stream projects and deep-sea harbors. None were without merit even though many lacked economic justification.

The Committee on Public Works has been occupied in these studies for many decades. The Corps of Engineers, cooperating, have utilized appropriated funds to make studies and submit detailed reports on authorized projects. Their filing cabinets are bulging with surveys, reports, cost estimates, and varying stages of plans that have accumulated over the years. Most of these are awaiting the time when Federal funds become available for construction. Some have been abandoned as no longer feasible.

I am advised that the estimated cost of navigation and flood control projects underway or on the drawing boards is approximately $7½ billion. From year to year these are carefully screened for priority by the Corps of Engineers, and to their great credit, no reactivated project is given their approval until after a careful restudy and reappraisal has been made in the light of changed conditions. The Corps of Engineers has performed a wonderful job in carrying out the enactments of the Congress. Their backlog of planned projects is dormant only because Congress has not seen fit to provide funds with which to complete their work. In the present state of the Nation's economy there is little prospect that funds for any sizable amount of already planned construction will be available in the foreseeable future.

Since it is clear to all that there is no end to the number of areas in the 48 States where public improvements could not be of benefit to residents therein, and since nearly every congressional district can justify a worthwhile project, it is only natural that representatives of these areas will continue to press Congress for aid in their development. Hence the number of authorizations continue to increase each year.

Now, in 1954, the Public Works Committee submits to the Congress an omnibus bill that will authorize nearly $1 billion for 150 or more additional public-works projects, many of which will probably lie quietly in the engineer's archives until they fade out with age awaiting appropriated dollars with which to bring their designs into being.

In an effort to meet the pressures from proponents for appropriation of available funds to be spread over wide areas, and with limited funds to allot, many deserving and economically sound projects are pushed aside, or, as is too often the case—especially with navigation facilities—they are allowed to become obsolete for want of maintenance and modernization.

This is particularly true in the Ohio River Basin. Beginning 50 years ago, over a period of 25 years, locks and dams that provided a 9-foot channel were completed at a cost of an estimated $300 million. Since that time the traffic on this stream has increased tenfold. Many of these structures have served their period of usefulness. Navigation is greatly impeded and frequently halted as a result of the failure of some of the dams to control their navigation pools. These structures need replacement in order that the economy developed over the period of their existence may not suffer injury.

Then there is the Monongahela, the greatest coal-carrying stream in the world, having similar difficulties, although improvements authorized years ago are still awaiting appropriations for their completion. Failure to modernize and maintain navigation structures on

this stream has caused the Pittsburgh area steel interests to abandon their most economical source of high-grade coal for lack of adequate transportation. A half-dozen flood-control projects in West Virginia, authorized many years ago, some of which are of vital concern to the residents of the Kanawha Valley and the city of Charleston because of their importance in maintaining an adequate supply of safe domestic water, lie dormant for lack of appropriations.

Aside from the fact that this bill projects public works well into the future and authorizes many projects that have little chance of every being completed, as a representative of the State of West Virginia, with its already authorized and deserving improvements pending, I can express little enthusiasm for an omnibus bill that has no provisions for the people of my State.

However, this statement is not intended to reflect neglect on the part of my committee. The Committee on Public Works during previous sessions, recognizing the needs of West Virginia, duly authorized the projects which have been mentioned, thereby fulfilling its obligations. From then on, the responsibility for allocating a fair share of moneys for public works rests with the Committee on Appropriations.

Most any public-works project can be justified as an asset to the community it serves. Not all of them can return their cost in dividends. It is a matter of regret that economically justified public improvements once initiated frequently fail to receive appropriations to insure completion and completed works of proven economic value are not properly maintained.

Anticipating future demands for public-works projects that promise to draw heavily on the Nation's tax resources, it would seem logical and necessary to call for drastic reductions in foreign-aid spending on public-works projects in order to permit much needed construction within our own borders.

I can suggest no more convincing evidence that this phase of our foreign policy should be changed than to cite the number, variety, and extent of meritorious public improvements included in this bill.

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

Mr. NEAL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. With reference to the project that I was discussing, the freeze order of President Truman in 1951 was for the purpose of saving that $1,300,000 for the Korean war effort. I have found since then that that was not covered back into the Treasury, but was used by the Army engineers for projects somewhere else in the United States.

Mr. NEAL. That may be true.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true, and it is not right.

Mr. NEAL. But, after all, I have no criticism of my committee when it comes to appropriating funds for any projects that are unfinished in the State of West Virginia. Appropriations are no part of our committee's duties. I feel that this bill covers many worthy projects, and if at any time in the future these projects can be allotted funds so that these people can realize the benefits which they need so much, I will be in favor of every project that we have endorsed, and certainly I am for this bill in every respect.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Public Works Committee for acting favorably on authorizing cooperation by the Federal Government in the project which will curb the flood conditions which damage areas in the Indiana Calumet industrial district at frequent intervals. During exceptional high water periods the Little Calumet River overflows its boundaries and inflicts devastating damage to homes and property over a considerable area in Lake County, Ind.

This project would provide adequate drainage and release the heavy flood conditions that during exceptional rain and spring thaw periods causes an uncontrollable high water deluge to the irreparable damage of hundreds of residents and industrial locations in the vicinity of the Calumet River. This flood condition hits an area that is thickly populated by thousands who are employed in the mills and factories of the largest industrial section in the State of Indiana. The construction of this watershed will indirectly benefit a wide area which is some distance removed from the location of the worst flood center. In the spring of 1947 and also 1948 the damage caused by floods in this area amounted to millions of dollars. If all the other projects set out in this omnibus bill are as meritorious as the Little Calumet River project in northwest Indiana, I hope this legislation is unanimously passed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of getting one small point clarified, which gives me just a little bit of trouble. On page 17, section 102, there is a provision for reimbursement of local interests in connection with beach-erosion projects under certain circumstances. On lines 5 and 6 of that page there is this proviso:

Provided, That the work which may have been done on these projects was approved by the Chief of Engineers as being—

I am perfectly certain in my own mind that that refers to the approval by the Chief at any time prior to the seeking of an appropriation. I think that is supported by the language of your report which, since I discussed this with you informally, I found on page 5 of the report. But I want to make entirely certain that that does not by any chance refer to a formal approval at the time the work was done or before the work was done because that approval could not be made anyhow, since the project is not authorized until this bill is passed.

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is a proper interpretation of it. In other words, any work done prior to the enactment of this bill, where it has been approved by the Chief of Army Engineers. The gentleman is referring to beach-erosion work?

Mr. HAND. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. That would come under this bill and be paid for accordingly.

Mr. HAND. So the interpretation, as I understand it, especially after having examined your report is that any time that the Chief of Engineers approved actual work done prior to seeking an appropriation, is what the act means; is that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right. That is the way I understand it, and I believe that is correct.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman very much. While I have 30 seconds remaining, I would like to thank the committee for its unfailing courtesy during these hearings. Permit me to add that the inclusion in this bill of the beach-erosion projects for Atlantic City, Ocean City, and Cape May is a culmination of my months and years of work in this field. I trust the bill will pass promptly, and that in due course funds will be made available.

The history of this effort goes back about 8 years, to the basic legislation, to which my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] made such an effective contribution.

Now, for the first time, we have a very real prospect of help from the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Committee on Public Works for including section 205, which provides:

In addition to previous authorization, the sum of $20 million is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by the Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended.

This will provide funds for continuance of such worthwhile projects as the Washita, Sandstone, Cowden-Cloud Chief, Beaver Creek, Cow Creek, and Hell Creek projects in Oklahoma, and other similar Oklahoma projects.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of congratulating the chairman of the committee and the members for reporting to the House what I consider to be an excellent piece of legislation, one that will make a great contribution to the internal domestic economy of America and one that will be an insurance against possible recession.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors for the consideration and courtesy which he gave to the local authorities from the Niagara frontier who came here to testify in support of the two projects included on page 10 of the bill, the Black Rock Channel on the Tonawanda River,

and the deepening of the Little River at Niagara Falls. The two projects obligate the United States to the extent of $300,000. Local interests are obligated to spend on those projects in excess of $300,000, which manifests the desire and the need of the people of our area for those two projects, projects which should have been started many, many years ago. The Tonawanda River carries annually 5 million tons of petroleum, coal, and oil. It is now only 16 feet deep. It forces vessels to lighten their loads before they reach their terminal, adding greatly to the cost of transportation in that area. If we are to get any benefit at all from the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation which was passed by this Congress, then our connecting waterways must be deepened to at least 21-foot draft, or we suffer disaster in our area.

I believe that if every area receiving appropriations under this bill benefited as greatly from the dollars expended as will the Niagara frontier, this bill should be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the members of this fine Public Works Committee deserve every commendation for the study and effort and long hours of work that have gone into bringing out this fine bill. I personally want to thank them for the patient consideration they have shown to many of us who have been before them.

Mr. Chairman, there are 10 projects in H. R. 9859 of importance to the residents of my district. Some are very small, as such things go, involving only slight proposed expenditures. Others are more elaborate and expensive but all are highly desirable, both as part of a general overall pattern and as an improvement in local facilities. The proposed costs run from a low of $20,300 to a high of $101 million.

These 10 items in this bill that affect the Eastern Shore of Maryland are set forth on pages 4 and 5, namely, the Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay; Queenstown Harbor; Little Creek, Kent Island; anchorage at Lowes Wharf; Nanticoke River at Bivalve; Webster Cove, Somerset County; Crisfield Harbor; Rhodes Point to Tylerton; Pocomoke River and Ocean City Harbor and Inlet; and Sinepuxent Bay.

If this measure becomes law and congressional authorization is obtained for these projects, important progress will have been accomplished but let no one be misled into believing that these improvements will be physically constructed in the immediate future. First the national policy of freezing new river and harbor construction unless tied in with National Defense will have to be modified.

And right here, let me point out that there are several projects in the First District of Maryland for which there has been authorization for several years but the freeze placed by the Bureau of the Budget in 1950 has held up construction of them indefinitely. This list includes the badly needed improvements at Cambridge Harbor; Rock Hall Harbor; Honga River and Tar Bay; Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River; widening of Kent Island Narrows, to name a few on which I, personally, have worked over the years. Funds were even appropriated to complete the first three on the list prior to 1950, but work orders were rescinded when the Korean fighting commenced.

Sometimes I am scolded for pushing for new authorizations while these older projects remain incomplete. The answer, of course, is that the interest of one project that is already authorized is not impaired by obtaining authorization for some other project in an entirely different area.

I find there is also another source of misunderstanding. Often I am asked, why has the Congress been urged to authorize these 10 projects and not the pet improvement in which the particular writer's community is vitally concerned? Only the other day I was asked rather sharply why St. Peters Creek was not included in the present bill.

Here again the answer is quite simple. The present bill contains all the projects in the district that have been favorably reported up to this time by the Corps of Army Engineers. The committee will not consider any others. Therefore, the ones that are not included have either been unfavorably reported or are not yet officially reported. The latter is the status, by the way, with respect to the very meritorious project for St. Peters Creek. I hope the engineers will approve it soon but to date they have not done so.

Mr. Chairman, pleasing as it is to secure authorizations for important and needed river and harbor improvements, after all it avails nothing until the work can be accomplished. Let us hope the Bureau of the Budget will soon lift the freeze. The cold war may last a long time. A thaw in this field is badly needed.

I am glad to be able to offer a bit of encouragement with respect to some maintenance work in the waters of the Chesapeake. I am advised that some activity of this type has been recommended to be initiated within the next few months.

These recommendations are as follows: Partial restoration of the jetty on the north side of the inlet at Ocean City, Md.; restoration of project dimensions in the channel in Chester River at the north end of Kent Island Narrows, in the channel connecting Chesapeake Bay and Honga River near Fishing Creek, in the channel leading from Tangier Sound to Ewell, and at Webster Cove, Somerset County.

I hope current maintenance plans will not be limited to these spots but welcome them as a step in the right direction.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of one of the 17 reclamation States, I want to say a word about the new Rivers, Harbors, Beach Erosion, and Flood Control Authorization Act which is now before us.

I can perhaps speak on this legislation less partially than some. There is not one dime of the $900 million authorization sought to be spent in Utah.

Mr. Chairman, during the past several weeks Members of Congress have been bombarded with literature in opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project. This project, now pending before the House Rules Committee, seeks authorization of $1 billion for construction of dams and irrigation works over a 50-year period. The project will make it possible for 4 arid western States to use their share of the waters of the Colorado River.

Despite the fact that the Colorado River storage project has received the support of President Eisenhower and the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, it has been attacked for containing "hidden subsidies."

The alleged subsidies are due to the fact that historically the Government does not charge interest on money advanced to construct irrigation works. This is a policy that has been a part of our reclamation law since 1902.

Leaving aside this policy, let us examine the financing of the upper Colorado project as a whole. I think it would be of interest to those supporting this legislation today to contrast the project with some of the multipurpose dams and harbors and beach-improvement authorizations contained in the bill before us. Less than 1 percent of the entire cost of the upper Colorado River storage project is nonreimbursable. No project in this bill before us today requires repayment of more than 40 percent of the cost and in most instances the entire cost of the project is nonreimbursable.

Nevertheless the upper Colorado River storage project is the one that has been under the heaviest attack from the so-called proponents of economy and the opponents of Government subsidy.

As a matter of proven fact the water and power users of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming will repay to the United States Treasury 99.2 percent of the cost of the upper Colorado River project, including interest on the total power investment. In addition, the operation, maintenance, and replacement charges will be borne by those who directly benefit from its construction. All this repayment will be completed within a 50-year period and the project will then produce for the Government an income of $15 to $20 millions per year in perpetuity.

I need only briefly mention the increased tax revenue that will result from lands that will be developed after the project is completed. This amounts to many times the cost of the project, as has been amply proved in other areas where reclamation has operated.

We in the arid West recognize the need for Government assistance to control floods, to dredge harbors and to prevent beach erosion. We have a difficult time, however, understanding the opposition of some of our eastern friends to western reclamation—when we in the West pledge our property to repay the cost of our projects—while beneficiaries in the East get theirs scot-free.

Let me compare the need for a flood control project with the need for a reclamation project.

The man along one of our rivers purchases some marginal land, knowing at the time of purchase that this land is subject to periodic floods. This fact only makes the land of low value. After purchasing it, however, he convinces Congress that a flood-control levee is necessary. This, in effect, drains his land and enhances its value, both for residential and for farm purposes. His advantage is obtained entirely at the cost of the taxpayers. He is under no obligation to pledge his land to repay the Government. Contrast that with a farmer in the west, who owns land that is subject to being cut off from an adequate water supply in years of drought. This man prevails upon Congress to advance funds for reclamation. His land and earning power will consequently improve—just as was that of his fellow citizen who had the river bank property.

Does our western farmer, however, expect the taxpayers of the Nation to bear this cost?

Indeed not—he contracts with the Government to repay every dime.

It is difficult for us to see reason in the argument that the Federal Government should pay the cost of making land arable if excess water is drained from it, while the beneficiary should pay the cost if land is made arable by having water brought to it.

This bill before us today, however, has provisions in it that we would be ashamed to ask for in the West.

Federal funds are being asked for in this legislation to improve bathing beaches and the requests are justified on the grounds that the Federal expenditure will increase the beaches' value. No one would deny this. If the Government wants to spend half a million dollars of the taxpayers' money improving resorts, of course the value of those beaches will be increased by half a million dollars. But it occurs to me that the beneficiaries of these projects—the owners of resort hotels, motels, and restaurants—should be required to repay some of this cost. This bill makes no provision for such repayment.

I do not want to belabor the Members with repeated arguments, but I want them to know that we in the West have trouble understanding opposition to self-liquidating reclamation projects from Members who are outspoken in their support of similar projects which require no repayment at all and which often, as in the case of flood-control structures, serve the same purpose.

I trust those who enthusiastically support this omnibus river and harbor bill today will be as enthusiastic in their support of a project that is necessary if four sovereign States are to grow and develop as nature intended.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I note with particular pleasure that the Committee on Public Works has included the Shilshole Bay breakwater in this bill, which is in my district. If you will look on pages 73 and 74 of the report you will see that this project has a very favorable ratio of benefits to cost of 1.74.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I may say that the people of Seattle have been trying to get this project for 20 years but not until the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] came here has it been possible to get it included in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. PELLY. The city of Seattle is cut in half by the Lake Washington ship canal and 200,000 people every day in automobiles have to pass over 4 drawbridges. This breakwater will allow some of the smaller boats to remain outside, and thus a bad traffic situation in the city, and bad congestion in the waterway and Government locks would be relieved. This is a very worthwhile and worthy project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to discuss a project in which I have been interested for the past several years at Brookville in Jefferson County, Pa. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here today on this public works bill, H. R. 9859, which includes flood-control projects. I just want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the Army engineers apparently do not seem to be interested in projects other than some gigantic, colossal, monumental projects that costs some several hundred millions of dollars. When you recommend to them a little project such as I am interested in at Brookville, Pa, which would give flood protection for this small community of several thousand people and which is periodically visited with these devastating floods, it would appear that because a project of this nature calls for the relocation of public utilities, sewers and highways, and so forth, that are troublesome, they do not become concerned about undertaking these surveys and reports.

Now I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that back in 1951, I appeared before the Public Works Committee with 2 projects, 1 at Reynoldsville, Pa., and 1 at Brookville, Pa. Now the one at Reynoldsville, Pa. is in the bill and the Brookville project left out. In 1951 this report for Brookville, Pa., was authorized by a resolution adopted the 18th of April 1951, by the House Committee on Public Works, and it was limited to a preliminary examination in scope. The preparation of the report was assigned by the Chief of Engineers, to the district engineer at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the general supervision of the division engineer, Ohio River division. Periodically since 1951 I have requested the United States engineers' office and also the district engineer to have this report completed, but somehow or other they failed to take action. Now, this matter involves two projects, 1 at Reynoldsville, Pa., and 1 at Brookville. They are part of the same project, on Sandy Lick Creek, Jefferson County, Pa., on the same stream. They are 10 miles apart. I am unable to understand why they completed the survey and report on one and not the other.

In view of the fact that I have insisted for the last 3 years to get this project report completed, they have failed to do so. Now they say, "Well, we did not have money available to conduct a survey." And that is why I contend they can find hundreds of thousands of dollars for surveys for these gigantic projects, but when it comes to a little flood-control project such as at Brookville, Pa., that would cost approximately $3,500 for the report and survey, that they cannot get that work finished. Now the people from the Brookville area are appealing to me to secure help from their Government for relief from these periodic devastating floods that every spring and summer are visited upon the community, destroying property and upsetting their economic and industrial life. In several instances industries located there are concerned about expansion because of flood conditions. Also, locating new industries becomes difficult because industrialists say: "We are not going to locate our industries in an area where you have these devastating floods that are visited on the community every spring and fall, and, therefore, until you can assure us that flood protection is given us, we are not interested or will not entertain such a proposal until we have such assurance."

So I have been before your committee repeatedly. I have talked to every member of your committee on both sides asking consideration. The failure of the engineers to develop the report is no fault of mine. Therefore I am unable to secure consideration for a small flood-control project such as this Brookville project that involves $600,000, where the people of this community were willing to raise the money by a bond issue to handle their part of the costs to give them the necessary flood protection. Now, it is not my fault. You say it is not your fault. You state you cannot accept this project because of the fact that the engineers have not prepared a report. The engineers have not prepared a report and therefore there is nothing that can be done.

I took the matter up with the United States engineers' office knowing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had prepared a report which had been submitted to the United States engineers' office and requested that an informal report be submitted to the Public Works Committee relative to the matter and basing it on the letter received from the Department of Forests and Waters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I shall quote parts of the letter from Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. It states:

> Reynoldsville and Brookville are both on Sandy Lick Creek, a subtributary of the Allegheny, though they are separated one from the other by a distance of approximately 10 river miles. As you know, we have completed a survey and report on the Reynoldsville project and have testified on this proposal in a recent hearing before your committee. Because the Reynoldsville project is a local channel improvement project and not immediately adjacent to Brookville, our field investigations at Reynoldsville have not necessitated surveying the Brookville area

downstream. The resolution your letter mentioned, calling for submission of a report of preliminary examination scope on Brookville, was approved by your committee on April 18, 1951. Since that time, as you know, funds appropriated for examinations and surveys have been most limited, allowing us to carry on only about 10 percent of our survey report backlog. We have not been able to make any funds available toward the Brookville examination and have been unable to accomplish any of the field work and office study necessary to permit the giving of sound estimates of cost or damage reduction.

Our recent informal queries to representatives of the department of forests and waters of the Commonwealth have established that they have developed preliminary plans for a possible Commonwealth project. Information of these plans have been transmitted to the borough. This proposal would involve certain channel improvement on the main stem and tributaries, as well as construction of certain walls and dikes to give protection against a flood equivalent to that of 1936. The Commonwealth stated its preliminary estimate of cost for construction to be $450,000, exclusive of relocations, lands, easements, and rights-of-way. If this plan were accepted, the borough would be expected to bear one-fourth of the cost of construction, provide lands, easements and rights-of-way, to give protection to the Commonwealth against damages, to arrange any necessary relocations, and undertake maintenance and operation of the project upon completion. I understand that the cost of lands, easements and rights-of-way has been estimated by the borough to approximate $150,000. I have not been able to secure any information to permit the establishment of economic justification for the Commonwealth's plan, but it has been reported to me that the Commonwealth has estimated that the 1936 flood caused damages which at present day prices would amount to $600,000. I believe the borough estimates these damages as somewhat higher.

So, it may be necessary to wait now for an additional 3 or 4 years before there is another authorization bill presented to the House, and the community of Brookville's progress is retarded. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has indicated a great interest in this project; the county has indicated a great interest in this project; and the local municipality has indicated its willingness to cooperate, but it cannot get the Federal Government to take action. Now, if we do not have another authorization bill for the next several years, then the project will be held up and held in abeyance until such a bill is presented. I call to your attention the fact that the United States engineers have turned in a remarkable performance both in times of peace and in times of war over a long period of years and I have every confidence in them. However, it is my opinion they should give more consideration to the small projects such as this Brookville, Pa., project in which I am interested.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to inform the gentleman that this bill contains a recommendation for two dams at a cost of at least $60 million that we do not want, and we are better off without, and we would just like to trade them to you.

Mr. GAVIN. I would certainly like to trade. I will settle for the $600,000 Brookville project rather than $60 million projects, and if you can work it out with the engineers, my good friend, I will be glad to accept your most generous offer. We would be saving the American taxpayers some $59 million and everyone would be pleased and satisfied. This merely proves what I have been stating.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Maybe we can work it out in conference.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

This House does not have a Member who is more diligent in his efforts to serve the people of his district than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. The gentleman has seen me many times concerning this project. He is not to blame personally for the situation that exists; neither is the Committee on Public Works of the House to blame, and neither is the Corps of Army Engineers.

In a few words, the situation is this. The Corps of Engineers state that they do not have enough money to make all the surveys requested of them. This survey was ordered in 1951. It has not been made. The corps claims they do not have enough money to make all of the surveys requested, and therefore this project has not been surveyed.

I hope that within the very near future money will be provided by the Congress to give the Engineers sufficient money to make the surveys which have been requested, including the project to which the gentleman has made reference in his district. I regret very much that the situation is as it is; but such are the facts.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I sincerely hope sufficient appropriations will be made by the Congress to permit these surveys, because these floods are devastating and costly. I think it is the wisest investment of the taxpayers' dollars the Congress can make to give flood protection to these small communities that are hit periodically with these destructive and recurring floods that destroy property and cause great damage, and in many instances wreck the economic and industrial life of these communities.

I want to say further to my good friend, although the gentleman regrets the situation we are in, that does not secure the authorization of the project at Brookville, Pa. I am interested in having the proposed project accepted in this bill, and if the gentleman can make any suggestions looking to that end, I would appreciate it.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman understands the workings and the procedure of the Congress. I am sure he would not ask anything that is either unreasonable or against the rules of the House.

Mr. GAVIN. I assure the gentleman that I am not unreasonable. I have been working on this project for several years. The people of this community, Brookville, Pa., have been patient and now expect their Government to give them some relief from these devastating floods, and they are entitled to it.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the Committee that it has been the custom for several years to read rivers and harbors bills by sections so that the Clerk will read one section at a time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question concerning one project. May I ask it now?

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it took the administrations of a number of Presidents before we could get $100 million for the St. Lawrence Seaway, which passed the Congress this year. I call attention to an item on page 4 of this bill. In this seven-line item there is an authorization of $101 million. That is for this one project. That is a million dollars more than the allotment for the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am not finding fault with this project, but it seems to me that the people of the Great Lakes area have to take about 40 years to get anything done for that area, while here there is, in a seven-line item, $101 million authorized. I assume it is a splendid project. I am not a member of this subcommittee, but this situation could not help but impress itself upon me, when I thought of the fact that we had to go through a full-dress debate here in the House on I do not know how many occasions—only to see the project go into the ashcan on all but the last—to get $100 million for the St. Lawrence Seaway. While, as I have said, here in a seven-line item $101 million is authorized. That is wonderful. The Members who fought for the St. Lawrence Seaway had to go through a very trying ordeal.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. We of the Middle West have been very patient and long-suffering. I think, in connection with the item to which the gentleman referred calling for $101 million and only seven lines in length in this bill that the question of national defense entered into it, as I remember the testimony before our committee. That had something to do with its being included in this bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I assume that the national defense question had not been divorced from the Great Lakes region. We were called the hub of the arsenal of democracy in the darkest hour of this country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, which, of course, I shall not, I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question or two. There is a project in my neighborhood, especially in the neighborhood of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for a project on the tributaries of the Red River in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana. I understand the report on that came in to the committee only on last Friday. There have been no hearings on it. Is it the policy of the committee not to accept any matters or any amendment to this bill upon which hearings have not been held and upon which there is not a favorable report?

Mr. DONDERO. That is the policy of the committee. I may say to my able and warm friend from Texas that the committee passed a resolution on June 28 to close the hearings. We have not heard anything since that date. In this case, the gentleman spoke to me about it. I endeavored to find some way whereby the project might be accepted, but it seems to transgress all the rules to do so. There have been no hearings either here or in the Senate on this particular project because it came in too late. In fact, it came in Friday night, and it is now at the printer's being printed.

Mr. RAYBURN. So the committee does not know exactly what is in the report?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public, No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document No. 243, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $74,000;

Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.: House Document No. 556, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $952,000;

Lynn Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 568, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash the cost of dredging the easterly 300 feet of the Municipal Channel to a depth of 22 feet, presently estimated to cost $4,700, before the work is undertaken;

Weymouth Fore River, Mass.: House Document No. 555, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,400,000;

Town River, Quincy, Mass.: House Document No. 108, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $525,000;

Scituate Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 241, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $375,000;

Fall River Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 405, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $694,000;

Bullocks Point Cove, R. I.: House Document No. 242, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $166,400;

Sakonnet Harbor, R. I.: House Document No. 436, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash, 4 percent of the cost of the project, presently estimated as $23,000;

Patchogue River, Conn.: House Document No. 164, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $135,000;

Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.: House Document No. 488, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $112,500;

Westchester Creek, N. Y.: House Document No. 92, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,200;

Hudson River, N. Y.: House Document No. 228, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $31,928,000;

Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.: House Document No. 89, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $138,000;

Hackensack River, N. J.: House Document No. 252, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,973,900;

Mispillion River, Del.: Senate Document No. 229, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $469,400;

Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document No. 123, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $101 million: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution for the construction of all bridges, including approaches thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

Queenstown Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 718, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $31,600;

Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Md.: House Document No. 715, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $23,000;

Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md.: House Document No. 90, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $29,000;

Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md.: House Document No. 91, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $192,600;

Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md.: House Document No. 619, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,300;

Crisfield Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 435, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.: House Document No. 51, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,100;

Pocomoke River, Md.: House Document No. 486, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $678,300;

Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.: House Document No. 444, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $704,000;

Parrotts Creek, Va.: House Document No. 46, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $38,700;

Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.: Senate Document No. 122, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,138,700;

Deep Creep, Accomack County, Va.: House Document No. 477, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $95,000;

Oyster Channel, Va.: Senate Document No. 49, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $75,200;

Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C.: House Document No. 453, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $108,000;

Smiths Creek, N. C.: House Document No. 170, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $102,000;

Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, N. C.: House Document No. 411, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $175,000;

Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway: House Document No. 379, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $43,200;

Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.: House Document No. 469, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $765,000;

Savannah Harbor, Ga.: House Document No. 110, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $414,900;

Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla.: House Document No. 446, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,200;

Hillsboro River, Fla.: House Document No. 567, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $16,600;

Apalachicola Bay, Fla.: House Document No. 156, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $98,000;

Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island: House Document No. 557, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $635,700;

St. Joseph Bay, Fla.: House Document No. 595, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,312,000;

Mobile Harbor, Ala.: House Document No. 74, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,778,000;

Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.: House Document No. 394, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $70,000;

Bayou Segnette Waterway, La.: House Document No. 413, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000;

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.: Senate Document No. 80, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,875,000;

Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex.: House Document No. 478, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $74,300;

Aransas Pass, Tex., in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: House Document No. 376, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $30,700;

Turtle Cove, Tex.: House Document No. 654, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,000;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: House Document No. 89, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $829,100: *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests;

Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.: House Document No. 251, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,600;

Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.: House Document No. 230, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $65,000;

Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn.: House Document No. 347, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $142,000;

Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: Senate Document No. 81, 83d Congress; and a monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of the Dover and Eureka Dams as described in House Document No. 761, 79th Congress, "Cumberland River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky," authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment of the project hereby approved;

Green and Barren Rivers, Ky.: Senate Document No. 82, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system work;

Knife River Harbor, Minn.: House Document No. 463, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of $219,900;

Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 434, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 554, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $217,200;

Holland Harbor, Mich.: House Document No. 282, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25 percent of the cost of dredging section B, but not to exceed $45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required by the project document;

Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.: House Document No. 142, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $225,000;

Toledo Harbor, Ohio.: House Document No. 620, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $512,000;

Erie Harbor, Pa.: House Document No. 345, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $174,000;

Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.: House Document No. 423, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $270,000;

Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: House Document No. 246, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $36,900;

Oswego Harbor, N. Y.: House Document No. 487, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,459,000;

Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.: House Document No. 161, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $896,500: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon this project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such payments shall not exceed the sum of $500,000;

Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.: House Document No. 389, 83d Congress: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and central basin recommended in the project report and presently estimated to cost $7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

Port Hueneme, Calif.: House Document No. 362, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,437,000;

Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,758,700;

Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $41,000;

Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington: House Document No. 249, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,555,000;

Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island: Senate Document No. 8, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $227,100;

Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.: House Document No. 425, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $977,000;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.: House Document No. 412, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $421,800;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Breakwater), Wash.: House Document No. ——, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,700;

Anacortes Harbor, Wash.: Senate Document No. 102, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,300;

Neah Bay, Wash.: House Document No. 404, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $139,250;

Bellingham Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 558, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,366,650;

Blaine Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 240, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $436,000;

Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.: House Document No. 536, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,397,300;

Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 155, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $477,900.

Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.: House Document No. 569, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $395,500;

Quillayute River, Wash.: House Document No. 579, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $425,550;

Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 182, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $81,200:

Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 182, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $116,600;

Honolulu Harbor, T. H.: House Document No. 717, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,022,000;

BEACH EROSION

Hampton Beach, N. H.: House Document No. 325, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $140,000;

Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 134, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $189,000;

Revere Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 146, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $402,900;

Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 145, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $109,000;

South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document No. 490, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $166,550;

Hammonassett River to East River (Area 2), Conn.: House Document No. 474, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $166,600 for Hammonassett Beach; $20,400 for Middle Beach;

New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3), Conn.: House Document No. 203, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $84,600 for Prospect Beach; $42,400 for Woodmont Shore; $13,100 for Gulf Beach; and $18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Conn.: House Document No. 248, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,510 for Short Beach; and $119,000 for Seaside Park;

Atlantic City, N. J.: House Document No. 538, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,044,000;

Ocean City, N. J.: House Document No. 184, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $105,000;

Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.: House Document No. 206, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $260,000;

Virginia Beach, Va.: House Document No. 186, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $525,514;

Pinellas County, Fla.: House Document No. 380, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $34,300;

Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document No. 28, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,176,400;

Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Document No. 229, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $185,000;

Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document No. 502, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and $68,900 for White City Park;

Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.: House Document No. 231, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,006,000;

Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.: House Document No. 343, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $136,500;

Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.: House Document No. 277, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,874,000;

Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.: House Document No. 349, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $65,700 for Seal Beach; and $91,600 for Surfside;

Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.: House Document No. 29, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $73,700;

Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document No. 227, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $283,700.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects was approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Mobile, Ala., and the State of Alabama, their successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend Channel, in the county of Mobile, Ala., by the construction and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama: *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be commenced until the plans and location therefor have been filed with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the causeway hereby authorized is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of this act and the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1954."

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, Numbered 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satifactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of

improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the following provisions shall be observed:

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecticut River Basin, approved by the act of June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, of a flood-control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene, N. H., in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs heretofore authorized.

That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecticut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend sites, in lieu of the plan of 8 reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the 8 reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 500, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,469,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 643, 80th Congress, with such modifications thereof as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the authorized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all work over and beyond that previous authorization such conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress, based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*, That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan authorized in this act which may be started prior to establishment of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $7 million for partial accomplishment of said plan.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the following items of work and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

(a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated February 2, 1954, as concurred in by the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1954, with such modifications as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation lock) of $32 million, in addition to the $15 million increase in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which $15 million shall be applied to the item described in this paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be necessary for construction of the project except that local interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended, with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, La.: *Provided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by the United States in connection with this item: *And provided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engineers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds herein authorized to be appropriated.

(b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Mississippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, La., substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 82d Congress, at an estimated additional cost of $440,000.

(c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 85, 83d Congress.

(d) Modification of the authorized project for the New Madrid floodway substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 183, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,743,000.

BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEX.

The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide flood protection for the city of Houston, Tex., as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939, and previous acts, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 250, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of $16,191,600.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEX.

The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 535, 81st Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40 million for partial accomplishment of that plan.

GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEX.

The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 344, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $30,254,000.

GUADALUPE RIVER, TEX.

The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Tex., authorized by section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such authorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the provisions of this act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approximately 750,000 acre-feet (of which 380,000 acre-feet shall be for flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood control, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of development of electric power, at an estimated total cost of $13,300,000.

The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Federal Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may appropriately be allocated by water conservation, stream-flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation. No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for development of electric power shall be made under this section unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such installation will actually be constructed.

The costs allocated to local interests under this section shall be not less than $1,400,000, and shall be paid by them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this act. The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for maintenance and operation of such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such operation and maintenance; the $1,400,000 to be contributed during the construction period shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for construction of the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that purpose; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by the Corps of En-

gineers, or by local interests in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accordance with this act, with all expenses of construction, operation, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local interests and with such power to be made available to such local interests.

Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir, $1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time or times during the period of such construction, as the Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the contributions allocated to local interests under section 2, with interest thereon at the rate of 2½ percent per annum, shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over a period not in excess of 50 years.

The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement with local interests providing for the payments heretofore described and for all other matters relating to the operation and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water conservation and stream-flow regulation for development of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide that the utilization of water for power development shall not be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimentation purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 464, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 436, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Okla., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 185, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $965,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River in urban areas at Alton, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 397, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of $2,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 281, 83d Congress, excepting only the improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Henderson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost for improvements authorized of $30,551,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8, Monroe County, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 396, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of $480,000.

The project on the Mississippi River for local flood protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 247, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,046,300.

The project for flood protection on the upper Iowa River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 375, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $979,600.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $144 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 642, 81st Congress, at an estimated additional cost of $73,710,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 549, 81st Congress.

The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., as modified and extended by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modified to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute not to exceed $2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Provided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and public relocations which local interests would have been required to bear had the approved Government plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton River, Iowa and Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 561, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $19,612,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux River, Iowa, authorized by the act of August 4, 1947, is hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 127, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of $10,076,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri River and tributaries at Marmarth, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 134, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $212,300.

COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 154, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $745,200.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 716, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000.

The project for flood control and related purposes on the Paint Rock River, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. —, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in that document, local interests shall comply with the provisions of local cooperation contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also construct and maintain local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally as outlined in House Document No. —, 83d Congress.

KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICH.

The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 98, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IND.

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 153, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, Calif., approved in the act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,110,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control on the American River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,600,000 for levees.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the lower San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated

the sum of $180 million for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, for which the sum of $75 million was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power development in the following projects in tributary basins, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 531, 81st Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oreg., and Green Peter Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg., including White Bridge, reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 54, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $380,000.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, T. H., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 529, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of $347,000.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditons: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Ipswich River, Mass.

Neponset River, Mass.

Juniata River at Lewiston and other points in Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control.

Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Tex.

Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.

Coos Bay, Oreg.

SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of $20 million is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended.

SEC. 206. That section 7 of the act approved August 18, 1941 (Public, No. 228, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 5 of the act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, No. 526, 79th Cong.), as further amended by the act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, No. 60, 83d Cong.), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

"That 75 percent of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein."

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary examinations and surveys or works of improvement authorized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure."

SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed $2 million from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than $100,000 shall be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year."

SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there shall be established in the civil works activities under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, 7 positions to be placed in grade GS-16 and 2 positions to be placed in grade GS-17, in the general schedule established by that act.

SEC. 210. That section 4 of the act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, No. 526, 79th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the Department of the Army, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 211. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1954."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: On page 19, line 4, add a new section as follows:

"Land will be acquired for the construction of flood control and multipurpose reservoirs authorized under this act in such a manner as to facilitate potential development of recreational uses of the reservoir by Federal, State, or local authorities, whenever such recreational development would not interfere with the basic purpose of the reservoir."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is the one I referred to in my remarks during general debate. As I stated then, this amendment is brought to the floor and was not acted on in committee because of the general agreement of the committee that it be withheld until this time.

At the time there was no report at all from the Corps of Engineers in regard to this amendment. We have since had an adverse report from the corps, but there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget, there is no report from the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife, no report from the Department of the Interior or any other Government agency that might have an equal concern in regard to the recreational development of the areas involved. So I think it is fair to state here that this amendment is actually something to give expression to the sense of the Congress in regard to recreational development in these areas. It in no sense would modify or change any reservoirs that are authorized under this bill, because they were all reported at a time when the land-acquisition policy to which I made reference had come into effect.

The amendment which I offer is designed to make certain that the reser-

voirs constructed under authorization of this act will be available to the general public throughout the country for recreational use; in other words, for those who want to hunt and fish and boat upon these reservoirs. Actually in this bill, in the first section, we are authorizing a great many expenditures for boat harbors, small-boat harbors in which no part of the use will be recreational. Here in this amendment I am merely seeking to state the sense of the Congress that these manmade lakes built at public expense should in no way be built in such a way as to deny their recreational development for the general public.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is aware of the fact that it has been the practice of the Army engineers in recent years to cede back to the State the frontage on a lot of these reservoirs. That has been the case with the Tygart Dam in West Virginia, which has made an excellent recreational center.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is quite correct. By this amendment, I am striving to make sure that that policy is not stopped. I asked the engineers to show me how this new policy would affect a lake or reservoir in Mississippi, and they told me that the recreational areas which had been established there, could not have been established under this new policy. The recreational areas are being built entirely at State and local and private expense with no expense at all to the Federal Government. I hope the committee will accept this amendment in order that we may indicate merely by this statement in the bill, which is very permissive in tone, that it is the desire of the Congress that these reservoirs, which would be constructed under this authority, will be available for recreational purposes to the general public.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I join with the gentleman in his statement. There is a reservoir in my district which is desired overwhelmingly by the people for recreational purposes, and I may say that the Army engineers have been most cooperative in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. One of the reservoirs, which I have in mind, was unanimously opposed originally by the people of the area because they did not want to give up their land, but now the people who live in that area are unanimously in favor of it because the recreational facilities are such a great asset.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment to overthrow the recently adopted policy of the Corps of Engineers with respect to land acquisitions?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The purpose is not to overthrow that policy, but merely to indicate that it is the sense of the Congress that that policy should not be administered in such a manner as to deny proper recreational development of those reservoirs being authorized in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. What does it mean then? Here the Corps of Engineers has adopted this new policy in order to get away from going in and purchasing a lot of land and taking that land off the tax rolls, thus depriving the local governments and private citizens locally the right to have that property on the tax rolls, and then arrogating to themselves the right to lease it or furnish it to whomever they might choose. I think there is a danger in that old policy, and I am afraid that the language that the gentleman suggests is throwing us right back into that kind of a policy.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The old policy had many mistakes in it and I am not trying to revert back to that old policy. I am merely attempting to say that in acquisitions that are made in the future, they should not be made in such a rigid way that the land that is to be acquired is not acquired in such a manner that they will deny the recreational development of the area. As the policy has been interpreted in certain areas that would be the effect of this new policy, and that would be without any particular savings to the Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi offered this amendment to our committee at one of its very last sessions. Of course, there was very little time to consider it. I think most members of the committee, including myself, were somewhat in sympathy with the objective that the gentleman desires to achieve by his amendment. However, I submitted his amendment to the agencies of Government interested, and they are opposed to it, particularly the Corps of Army Engineers. The reason they are opposed to it is because of the recently established policy between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior in regard to land acquisition. I want to read from the report of the engineers, which has been submitted to me by Gen. B. L. Robinson, Acting Chief of Engineers, a few lines that pertain to the question before the committee.

He says:

> The acquisition of lands for recreational development, as contemplated by the proposed Smith amendment, is not in accord with this policy, and therefore I am unable to concur in the amendment.

That comes from the Department of the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture, also commenting on this amendment, had this to say, after discussing the question of acquisition of land for recreational purposes:

> However, it is felt that the policy respecting acquisition of lands for recreational purposes should be considered along with other policy questions relating to the responsibility of the Federal Government in the recreational field at all Federal reservoir areas. It is understood that the Bureau of the Budget is currently studying these matters.

The Bureau of the Budget has not reported on the amendment, because it was offered so late.

To adopt this amendment would override the findings of the Army engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture, because they believe that the policy now established between the Army engineers and the Department of the Interior fully covers it. Therefore, to adopt this amendment might run counter to that policy and would do more harm than good. For that reason I ask the committee to vote down the amendment.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This matter came up in the course of our hearings on the Army civil-functions appropriation bill this year, and it was explained to the members of our subcommittee to some extent. While the language of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is broad, simply stating an objective, I cannot feel other than that adopting this amendment, in view of the fact that there has been a change of policy within the course of the last year or so, would be interpreted as expressing the will of Congress contrary to the adoption of this new policy, and would, in effect, put us on record that Congress wished them to go back to the old policy which was in effect at that time. Since that includes condemnation of land, separation of private property by the Federal Government, for purposes which extend over into the marginal area, as far as the public is concerned, I do not think the House ought to take this step, in the light of the background and the interpretation that would be placed upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to point out in respect to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin that if I desired to establish a new land act policy I would have so stated. I am simply trying to establish in this amendment the sense of the Congress that these man-made lakes, which were created at an expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, should be made available to the general public for recreational development. I do not feel that this Congress wants to go on record, by turning down this amendment, that it does not believe in recreational development.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is one of the most hardworking and diligent members of the Committee on Public Works. He is also one of the most constructive. I am opposed to his amendment, however, not because I object to the idea, but because I think the Committee on Public Works and the House itself have not had time to evaluate his suggestion. His proposal was made not to any meeting of the Committee on Flood Control but in the next to the last session of the Public Works Committee. We had no opportunity to study it. I have a phobia against this continual

acquisition of more and more land by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government today owns 711,000 square miles of land in the 48 States of the Union, or 455 million acres. One acre out of every four is owned by the Federal Government and has been taken off the tax rolls. I think we ought to reverse that policy. The gentleman's amendment should lay over until next year, until the beginning of next year at which time he may introduce a bill covering this situation so that it can have the study of the Public Works Committee. I am not objecting to the idea, but I do not think we ought to go into something in haste, then repent at leisure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) there were—ayes 19, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 35, immediately after line 6 insert:

"WEST SHORE OF LAKE ERIE

"The projects for flood protection along the shores of Lake Erie are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 424, 83d Congress at an estimated cost of $1,900,000."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of directing my remarks to the Public Works Committee in the hope I may persuade that committee that this project recommended by the Corps of Engineers be included in this omnibus legislation.

I might first point out that the area involved is on the west shore of Lake Erie, Monroe County, in the Second District of Michigan which I have the honor to represent. In March of 1952 this area was devastated by a flood which resulted from two main factors. One was the high level of the Great Lakes; the other unusually severe storms. I might point out that this west shore of Lake Erie lies roughly between Toledo and the mouth of the Detroit River. Of the two projects involved Lakewood Luna Pier is just north of Toledo, and Detroit Beach is north of the city of Monroe, the county seat of Monroe County.

The Lakewood Luna Pier project would cost approximately a million dollars and the Detroit Beach project would cost approximately $500,000.

After the flood which I mentioned in March 1952 the Public Works Committee of the House, the committee in charge of this legislation, adopted a resolution on June 26, 1952, in which it instructed the Corps of Engineers to make a study of the high levels of the Great Lakes.

Included in that resolution—and this is of extreme importance to me—we find this language: This study by the Corps of Engineers should be undertaken "with a view to determining the property damage resulting from changes in levels of the Great Lakes and the feasibility of measures to prevent the recurrence of damage."

It was pursuant to the instructions of the Committee on Public Works that the Corps of Engineers made this study, and after looking over the subject, recommended three projects in this extremely low lying area on the western shore of Lake Erie.

I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], will confirm my statement, that the committee did not refuse to include these projects in this omnibus bill on their merits but only because of a legal technicality. A doubt was raised by the Budget Bureau whether flood-control projects on the Great Lakes are permissible under existing legislation or whether there ought to be an amendment to the general legislation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. It was the feeling of the subcommittee that perhaps there was a great deal of merit to those projects which have been surveyed. On the other hand, there is no basic law to justify Congress going ahead and turning out these projects regarding floods which are the result of a continuing rise of the water level in the lake. It was the fear of the committee that if we placed these projects in the authorization bill, that we would open up that bill to the inclusion of similar projects in all parts of the country where they had not heretofore been included. It was the feeling of the committee that some basic legislation should be enacted by the Congress prior to the time that projects of that kind were considered. So we are recommending that they introduce basic legislation in the next Congress to clarify the situation where areas are so damaged from rising lake waters and the storms and the waves.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. I might say that the Corps of Engineers testified before the Committee on Public Works of the House as well as the committee in the other body and seemed to be of the opinion that existing law did authorize these projects. The question was raised by the Bureau of the Budget, which did not disapprove the engineers' report but did raise this question which bothers the committee.

I might point out for the Committee's information that already in this same area two projects have been approved in the past for the same kind of damage, Reno Beach and Howard Farms, east of Toledo on Lake Erie, in the district represented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS]. Another precedent is Estral Beach, between Monroe and Detroit on Lake Erie, which suffered severe damage in March of 1952. The Corps of Engineers from its emergency fund repaired an existing dike at Estral Beach to protect it from the same kind of flood damage with which we are concerned here.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not recall that project being mentioned as a precedent, although Reno Beach-Howard Farms project, which was previously carried out, somewhat similar to this, was cited as a possible precedent.

Mr. MEADER. The St. Lawrence Seaway has now become law and shortly will become a reality. Now, in the levels of lakes and rivers, there are always two conflicting interests: First, there are those who desire to use those lakes and rivers for navigation purposes, and second there are the riparian owners who seek protection from high waters and floods. The St. Lawrence Seaway will be useful only if deep-draft vessels can use the channels and the harbors. The depth of the water will very substantially affect the utility of the St. Lawrence Seaway system.

I want to quote from an article by Prof. William C. Hoad, of the University of Michigan, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks, volume 99, part 1, page 1374:

Another and vastly more important benefit (of high water levels) is the increased depth in harbors and dredged navigation channels, which permits the big freight carriers to load to greater depths. During the hearings on the Chicago drainage canal controversy, back in 1925, the Lake Carriers' Association produced figures to show that freight savings or losses amounted to $500,000 a year for each inch of increase or decrease of depth in the navigation channels. The carrying of ore, grain, coal, and other bulk commodities in Great Lakes channels has increased considerably since then, while costs per ton of freight moved have also shown a large increase as measured in present-day dollars.

In other words, the cost of these projects, roughly, $1,500,000, would be offset by the reduced cost of carrying the traffic and freight on the Great Lakes, and in the reduced cost for the reduced amount of dredging which would be necessary if you are to protect the riparian owners at the same time you are providing adequate channels for deep draft navigation.

I hope the committee will give this matter serious consideration and if it should, perhaps, be adopted in the other body, I hope the subcommittee in charge of this measure will feel kindly disposed toward it in conference. I know how difficult it is to persuade the Committee of the Whole to take action in opposition to the work of a committee that has studied a matter so very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent and at the request of Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MEADER was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. I should like to say to the House that the gentleman has been most diligent in bringing this project before the subcommittee and also to my attention on several occasions. It so happens that I live not too far from where this project is located, and I personally know something of the problem that confronts the people in that area. In fact, I fly over it about once a month. I can see it from the air. I hope, too, the law will be clarified so that this matter may be considered at some future time so that the objective which the gentleman has in mind, through his

amendment, which he intended to offer, will be achieved.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman in an amendment that he has offered. The third of the three projects, Point Place, lies within my district and within the city of Toledo. I want to express my appreciation to the committee and particularly to the subcommittee for the very excellent hearing which they gave us on this subject.

Colonel Starbird from the Corps of Engineers testified on this and recommended it, speaking for the Corps of Engineers.

I feel that the opposition of the committee to this project arises principally because of the fact that they are associating this with the tides and floods that are common on the ocean and not on the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes, after all, are a river system somewhat extended because of the glacial deposits. The floods come not at regular intervals, but for the same reason that the floods come on the Ohio River. There is a building up of moisture in the headwaters and an increase in precipitation in the locality, which causes the flood. It is exactly like the floods in the Ohio River the subject matter of which admittedly is under the jurisdiction and under the force of the law in effect. When the snow is built up in Canada and the upper lakes and then we have an excess of precipitation in the Lake Erie area, we have these floods that are so devastating. In the last flood in this Point Place area, which is the third on the map before you, the damage to that locality was about $240,000. That is more than half the cost the engineers estimate for this project, which will be an all-time benefit.

This dike they propose is not a new project. The dike has been built by the local people there and by the city of Toledo and by the township. This project is for the purpose of making a permanent dike out of it, one that will last for all time and will protect this property from these regular inundations that come from exactly the same kind of water and the same sources that the floods on the Ohio River come from.

Mr. Chairman, I ask consideration for this amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Flood Control voted unanimously against the inclusion of this project in the authorization bill. The committee, nevertheless, was very much impressed by arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] that the project had considerable merit. However, it was the feeling of the committee that if the committee voted this project into the authorization bill we would establish a precedent whereby we would be compelled in the future to include all projects for all areas on all lakes where the land area was damaged by high lake waters.

The water laws of our Nation are complicated. If the flood comes from a stream or a river, the Federal Government pays all the cost of providing flood-control works except that of acquiring easements, rights-of-way, and the relocation of highway bridges. In the case of beach erosion along the ocean shore it is necessary that the local interests, provided all the land is publicly owned, put up two-thirds of the cost. The Federal Government will put up only one-third of the cost.

It was the unanimous feeling of the committee that before projects of the kind mentioned in his amendment be accepted that changes should be made in the basic law. Our commitee recommends to gentlemen, who are interested in projects of this kind, that they introduce such basic legislation at the opening of the new session of Congress.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REAMS. May I ask the gentleman again not to confuse this project with erosion or with a flood that comes from the tides. This is high water just like on the rivers. The lakes just rise and get higher, just exactly as the Ohio River does.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman's argument that a lake is really not a lake but just a wide space in the river is very ingenious. The committee, however, cannot accept that argument.

Furthermore, the Army engineers have requested $970,000 to carry on an investigation of the entire problem of this rising of the lake waters in the Great Lakes. Perhaps the engineers will find within a very short time a better solution than has been proposed to correct the situation of which Mr. REAMS and Mr. MEADER complain.

The main objection of the committee, however, is that this amendment changes the flood control and beach-erosion laws of the Nation. Before we do that, there should be some basic legislation to justify action on legislation of this kind.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works I want to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], and I wholeheartedly associate myself with his amendment.

These floods on the Great Lakes are something that do not occur with any degree of frequency. When they do happen they can be very devastating, just as the floods of the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri are. We certainly feel it is the responsibility of the Federal Government in those cases.

As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] has pointed out, there is ample precedent for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. What the gentleman offers here was recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers.

I would like to point out that these are international waters on the Great Lakes. These are not just any lakes within the territorial United States, these are international waters. I believe there is plenty of precedent for this. I do not think we have to interpret existing laws unreasonably in order to vote with a clear conscience in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 31, after line 6, insert the following:

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, at St. Louis, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. —, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $112,880,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, at this time having offered the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and explain the reason for presenting it in this fashion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment was offered to call to the attention of the House that this is a longtime part of the overall plan in the Mississippi River flood-control program, and has been in the offing for at least the past 20 years. The reason it has not been before us before now is that it has taken some considerable time to make the surveys and studies. As you can see, from the amount of money in this project, $112 million, it is a sizable project. The survey of the Army engineers was not completed in time for this matter to have been brought to the attention of our House committee, and that is the reason I am withdrawing the amendment, because it would be contrary to the procedure of the committee to consider it on the floor. However, this project has been submitted to the Public Works Committee of the other body and hearings have been held on it. It is entirely possible that the other body will put this particular project in their companion bill, and, therefore, it might be a matter upon which our committee in conference might be called upon to consider. For that reason, I wanted to call it to the attention of the House. I want to say again in this connection that this is an old plan. The actual survey and plans, of course, have just recently been developed. One of the things that is causing difficulty is that in the planning for flood control around St. Louis, Mo., the levees and dikes on the east side were built up to meet the overall plan while the corresponding levees on the west side of the river were not built up, and the result has been that these sections of

St. Louis, which is North St. Louis, along the river, and South St. Louis have, in effect, had the water which would normally have gone over into the flood areas of Illinois pouring over into the industrial areas of the city of St. Louis. In my opinion, we should never go down the river one side at a time. We ought to go down the river on both sides. For that reason, it is most urgent that this project, which should have been built many years ago, be given consideration by the House as promptly as possible. Anything this size, of course, is going to take many, many years to build and any appropriations for it would cover a period of many years.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 32, line 2, immediately before the first comma, insert "exclusive of the Perry Dam."

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not take too much time on this, having explained my position during general debate.

This dam proposed at Perry, Kans., is one of a number of dams that is supposedly intended to prevent floods on the Kaw River. This Congress and previous Congresses have authorized flood-control programs that are well underway.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the gentleman's amendment merely take out the Perry Dam and not the Milford Dam?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I have two amendments.

Mr. MACK of Washington. You are taking out the Perry Dam by this amendment, and by a later amendment the Milford Dam?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That is right. I have here a picture of the Delaware River, only a hundred miles long; 922 square miles; one-sixtieth part of the Kansas River Basin that we are trying to dam up in order to protect some of the cities down below. Already this Congress has provided a program of flood prevention above this dam that is already under way. The pilot watersheds that you authorized in the 82d Congress and for which you appropriated money in the first session of this Congress, are already under construction in this particular area. Many of those dams are in process of construction. Two of them are already completed. So well are they doing the job, so much better than anyone thought, that the soil-conservation officials in our area are staging one of the biggest celebrations for the 18th of next month, to show what these dams will do. When a matter of $60 million is under consideration in 5 or 10 minutes' time, perhaps it is something to which we should well give attention.

I wish to say that we believe that this celebration which will be staged on the 18th of next month will be attended by thousands of people from Kansas and the surrounding States. All Members of Congress are invited. Louis Bromfield will be the speaker, and we will demonstrate to the American people the new and up-to-date way of preventing floods on these rivers.

I have put this red mark down here where this dam is to go, for the reason that the people out there in my district see red every time you mention Perry Dam to them. They are convinced that there is a better way, and they are doing it.

Mr. Chairman, does it seem feasible that this Congress would provide millions of dollars for upstream flood prevention and at the same time spend additional millions at the other end when there will be no flood down there after our watershed program has been completed?

I have here a picture of a subwatershed—one of the pilot watersheds that this Congress authorized this year, under process of construction. These red marks are the dams that have been authorized by this Congress, and that are partly completed. This is dam No. 1. It was completed before the big flood that they had a month ago, and it was hardly filled. It took 2½ days for the water to go by that spillway, which otherwise would have gone by in that many hours.

I have here a letter from the county commissioner of Brown County, where this dam is located, stating that this one dam alone which is costing $7,900 will save the county $15,000 on one bridge.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is the product of soil conservation investigations that we have had through the years, beginning with Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, and coming on down to the present time.

I fully realize the considerations under which the committee has brought in a recommendation for authorization of this dam at Perry, Kans., in the low-gradient areas of the Delaware River. I was present and heard the testimony and have read the hearings.

I understand the situation of the people who have constructed gigantic industrial enterprises on the banks of the Kansas River, and of the good people who have built homes on the flat overflow land. I have full sympathy for them and am in favor of every reasonable measure of protection in the way of dikes, flow ways, and channel improvement. I oppose the dams only because I feel that they are impracticable and antiquated, that they will not do what they are represented to do, and because there is a better way to prevent floods than by building hugs dams in the river channels.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed dam at Perry, Kans., is estimated to cost $16,263,000. We all know it will cost more than the estimate. They always do. It will permanently destroy 14,120 acres of as good farmland as there is in the United States. It is designed as one of more than a hundred dams proposed to protect Kansas City. Many competent engineers state positively that they will not do it. That is, if such a storm as we had in 1951 should occur between Topeka and Kansas City, all the dams proposed by the Corps of Engineers would not avert a flood. I have documentary evidence to substantiate all these statements.

The people of my district do not want these dams, and they so registered their convictions in the last election. This proposed dam at Perry figured in that campaign along with the dam at Tuttle Creek. Right here will you permit me to digress long enough to make it plain that the name of that stream is "Tuttle Creek," "not Turtle Creek," as some of my colleagues have mistaken it to be. If these dams should be constructed, the name could well be changed to "Turtle Creek" for that good valley would be inhabited by turtles instead of people.

In this upstream flood-prevention program, the landowner stands 50 percent of the cost; whereas in the proposed river channel big-dam program the entire cost is assessed against the Federal Government. The 82d Congress enacted a law providing for development of 62 pilot watersheds to determine the possibilities of preventing or minimizing floods by upstream watershed development. The first session of this Congress appropriated funds to implement that program. Because the Kansas River Valley is a critical flood area, 3 of these pilot projects are located in my district, and 2 of them are a part of this same Delaware River Basin where this Perry Dam is to be constructed.

Six weeks ago this area experienced one of the severest storms on record. One of the seven dams was nearing completion and it performed equal to all expectations. Floodwater that would have passed that dam site within 2 hours, without these flood-detention measures, would require 5½ days passing through the drawdown tube.

Mr. Chairman, modern machinery, American ingenuity, and a will to conquer have largely solved this flood-prevention problem so far as it can be solved. It is now possible to control the water where it falls and to keep it under control. That is the watershed program. This dam I would strike from the bill is at cross purposes with this program.

Mr. Chairman, there is yet another and very compelling reason why this antiquated dam project should be stricken from this bill. A few weeks ago the National Rivers and Harbors Association held its annual convention in this city. President Eisenhower was invited to address the meeting. Let me quote from his speech on that occasion. These are his words:

> I have become convinced that before very long America will almost unanimously look upon water as its single greatest resource.
>
> So when a project is proposed that seems to me to be unrelated to all of the necessities of a river valley or of a slope in which it is located, I am very cold and unsympathetic. I believe that we have got to get into the Continental Divide and say—from there on down to the sea, studying where each drop of water falls—what we are going to do with it until it reaches the sea. I believe that any lesser survey of our water resources, our water uses, and our water control is completely piecemeal, and we should reject it.

I am convinced that these are some of the most memorable words spoken in American history. They may come to be the bill of rights of our water-control program. They envision exactly what

is being exemplified in the pilot watershed projects scattered over the Nation at this time. This amendment is in full accord with the program initiated by this Congress, and the expressed views of the President of the United States.

Summarizing, Mr. Chairman, this is the situation: Here is a river basin of 922 square miles that in times past has sometimes contributed a small part of the flood water of the Kaw basin comprising more than 60,000 square miles. Congress has provided a program of flood prevention for this small river basin to be carried out in conjunction with the landowners—a kind of home rule if you please. They are working on this program. This is the kind of program the people believe in.

Someone not in the district wants a different kind of big dam program. The people do not believe in it, and object to it. The question before the House is: Are we going to force it upon them? The answer is "No." Vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. Chairman, in 1951, immediately following the billion-dollar flood in the Kansas-Kaw Basin, many members of the Public Works Committee visited the disaster area. We saw mud 2 to 3 feet deep in the streets. We saw thousands of homes filled with muck and mud, with women inside these houses shoveling the mud out. We saw davenports, overstuffed furniture, and even grand pianos thrown into the streets for the garbagemen to come and get. They were beyond repair or reclaiming. We saw grain elevators damaged. We saw tens of thousands of acres covered with 2 to 4 feet of sand.

We were told by the United States Army engineers that they blew the carcasses of 10,000 animals out of the treetops. The animals had landed in the trees during high water and then died of starvation or exhaustion. That one flood, Mr. Chairman, in that valley occasioned more than a billion dollars worth of damage, according to estimates of the United States Army engineers.

Members of the Public Works Committee who saw the horror and the damage of that flood were convinced that something ought to be done to prevent a recurrence of disasters of that magnitude.

During the present Congress the Army engineers came before us and recommended the idea of large reservoirs as the best known means to prevent future floods in this area.

Mr. Chairman, a large reservoir always is a controversial matter. It is a controversial issue because those who live above the reservoir do not want it built. The floods in the upper reaches of a river where the reservoir goes are usually not very severe and usually do not cause great damage. It is downstream where the cities are inundated by floodwaters that the great damage occurs. The people downstream desire flood control that will give them protection. The downstream people are for the big reservoirs.

When we go into a hearing on the big-reservoir idea thousands of people write to the committee protesting the big reservoirs. They are the people who live in the upper reaches of the river and who are little damaged by the floods. Down below equally large numbers of people write the committee urging that the large reservoirs be built in order to provide them flood protection.

The proposal here is that we build 2 dams, the Milford Dam and the Perry Dam, at a cost of approximately $55 million and that also we build protective works around 9 cities, those works to cost a total of $25 million.

The engineers testified that if we built the dikes, and did not provide the large reservoirs, that the dikes would be deathtraps. The engineers testified that the dikes around the large cities would be of no value whatsoever unless the reservoirs also were built. The engineers testified that they could not stop the floods by building small dams far up in the upper reaches of the river, as done in the soil-conservation program.

It is true that these 2 proposed dams will inundate 30,000 acres of land. There is one small village of 500 where the people complained against the dam because, they said, 30,000 acres would be taken out of cultivation and the town would lose customers for its stores.

Sixteen cities, the largest cities in the area affected by floods, sent representatives to a district meeting to discuss the merits of this proposal. That meeting of the representatives of 16 cities voted 15 to 1 in favor of the construction of the big reservoirs. The committee heard testimony by a very competent engineer, one who was very highly recommended to us, who said that in order to secure flood control in an area like this would require the building of from 900 to 1,000 small dams instead of 2 large dams. He testified it would cost $140 an acre to secure flood-control protection from small dams against $50 an acre to obtain the same protection from the large-dam idea. On the basis of the evidence submitted, the Flood Control Committee is unanimously of the opinion that these two dams should be authorized as recommended by the Army engineers. The committee believes these dams will give protection to the hundreds of thousands of people who live downstream.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] may extend his remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I shall make will apply equally to Milford Dam and Perry Dam. From the explanation given by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], it is quite evident that this committee, which has done such a splendid job, did not overlook or have any facts escape their attention, but it shows that the proponents of these dams, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] said, proved their case.

Mr. Chairman, of course, Milford and Perry will not do the job alone, but those two dams are part of an integral program of reservoirs and local protective works which has been developed and is being developed. They are an essential and necessary key in that program, without which the local protective works lose most, if not all, of their value.

Somebody has said that there is nothing deader than the headlines in last week's newspaper. But I hope the time never comes when this Congress or any other group of Americans will ever forget the headlines such as this one in the Kansas City Star which they saw on black Friday, July 13, 1951, when the greatest flood in all history came down the Kansas River Valley, sweeping down across the farms and towns and into the two Kansas Citys and on down to St. Louis; a flood which created the most havoc and devastation ever known in the flood history of the United States.

Here is another headline of a similar character from my hometown paper, the Kansas City Kansan. If you think it was not of nationwide importance, here is the headline of the Washington Evening Star, and you know it must have been a devastating flood to get that kind of a headline in this metropolitan area.

I could tell you many, many things about that flood. Heartbreaks, yes, they were there, ruined homes, wrecked businesses, and flooded fields. I would remind you that is a comparatively small number of people in the upper reaches who oppose these dams will be paid every single solitary dime of loss that they suffer in the taking of their farms or their homes, whereas those of us downstream pay all of the losses ourselves, taking on a load of debt. Nobody helps us out as much as a single nickel, despite efforts made to bring them some relief.

I would remind you that in this flood of 1951, 25 lives were lost, $725 million worth of damage done in Kansas City, and many more millions down in Missouri. Talk about a few thousand acres being flooded to make a reservoir. Eight hundred and ninety-two thousand acres were flooded in this one disaster, and we get them almost every year, thought not this serious. Ten thousand farms were flooded, 116 towns, 22,000 homes, 5,000 places of business felt the force of the ruinous torrents. Ninety thousand people were run out of their homes. The loss was more than a billion and a half dollars. Uncle Sam's Treasury suffered a loss in taxes more than a third of a billion—more than 5 times the cost of these 2 proposed dams. In my hometown of Kansas City, Kans., 7,500 acres were inundated, $300 million damage was suffered, and 17,000 people driven out of their homes in the middle of the night, saving only what they could carry.

Fifty-seven hundred homes were flooded and less than one-third of them are rebuildable. Five thousand or more people had to live in trailers and other makeshift shelter while they found other space. The loss of income alone ran $360,000 a day. Their courage has been great. In confidence that relief from floods would come, they have rebuilt.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the words of Edward R. Murrow after he had seen this area 4 months after the occurrence. Here is what he said.

This need not have happened: It wasn't a tornado or a war which men are unable to control. It was done by a couple of rivers, and we know that rivers can be controlled. It costs a lot of money, and when a flood hits, as it did here, most of the country is not really aware of it—no matter how good or accurate the reporting may be. Some of the people who live right here didn't realize what had happened down in the flats till they went down to look. I had read and heard as much about that flood as most people because news is my business, but I was wholly unprepared for what I saw, even 4 months after the water subsided. If everyone who has to vote on flood-control dams and reservoirs could look at this result, we might put in motion the means of preventing a repetition.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this bill without these amendments will justify the faith of these courageous Kansans in their Congress.

With them it is not a matter of debate over the merits of little or big dams—with them it is a matter of survival. It is a matter of—yes—life and death.

Mr. Chairman, this program is the means, and the only means, of preventing the repetition not only of the damage which has been so catastrophic that words of man cannot even start to describe it, but also the annual recurring losses in the Kaw Valley.

I sincerely trust that the entire House will support the judgment of the committee and retain these dams in this program by defeating the amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman on his fight for flood control and on his excellent description of the situation in the flood of 1951. My district adjoins his. I would like to corroborate everything he said and urge that this amendment be defeated because the construction of these dams proposed by the Committee on Public Works is needed if we are to control floods of this kind in his district and in mine.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as you may remember, a record flood came out of the Kansas River in 1951, doing damage along that river and along the Missouri River in the amount of almost $1 billion. That flood was a disaster of terrific national proportions. As you may remember, too, representatives of the House Public Works Committee, during the flood, flew to the scene to investigate. I was one of the representatives who made this trip. We toured such of the area as could be reached, inspected the several damaged cities along the Kansas and Missouri Rivers, and flew over the extensive and fertile, but inundated, river plains. All of us making that inspection were tremendously impressed by the scale and severity of the damage. I believe all of us were convinced that every effort should be made, and as early as possible, to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster.

The Public Works Committee, when it considered the plan of improvement for the Kansas Basin now before you for authorization, heard testimony for the better part of 2 days. Upstream landowners, downstream farmers, and representatives of areas and municipalities, all appeared. We gave careful study to their testimony prior to reaching our decision. From that study we became convinced that the improvements now recommended, as well as those already authorized, are essential in any plan which will prevent a recurrence of disaster such as that of 1951.

The recommended modification you are now considering would add to the authorized plan for the Kansas Basin nine local protection improvements to protect cities. All of these cities were heavily damaged in 1951 and, generally, the construction to be accomplished at each location is dependent, for safe operation, on upstream reservoirs to reduce materially flood flows. The recommended modification would add, also, to the comprehensive plan for the Kansas two critical reservoirs, reservoirs in the lower basin.

Reservoirs already built, under construction, or authorized, will control the major tributaries of the Kansas River except for 4,200 square miles of the Republican River drainage area below the existing Harlan County Reservoir, and the 1,140-square-mile drainage area of the Delaware River. These two areas are in the central and eastern portions of the Kansas Basin and are therefore in the more humid and higher rainfall area. Both are critical flood-producing areas. The Milford Reservoir is designed to control the major portion of the 4,200 square miles of the lower Republican, while Perry Reservoir is necessary to cotrol the major part of the 1,140-square-mile Delaware Basin.

Milford and Perry Reservoirs had been found necessary in studies completed even before the 1951 storms. All studies undertaken since—and very, very comprehensive investigations have been made—confirm and further emphasize the need for controlling these now uncontrolled areas by the two reservoirs in question.

Data furnished the committee concerning the effect that these two reservoirs would have had on the 1951 flood flows dramatically illustrate their capabilities. Peak discharge on the Republican River at Manhattan, Kans., would have been reduced from the 60,000 cubic feet per second actually experienced to only 20,000 cubic feet per second. Peak discharge on the Delaware at Perry, Kans., would have been reduced from the 108,000 cubic feet per second experienced to only 10,000 cubic feet per second. This control of the tributary flood flows would have significantly reduced flows on the Kansas River downstream. The Kansas River flood plain down stream from the mouth of the Republican River contains 154,000 acres of some of the richest, most highly developed farmland in the Kansas Basin, numerous small towns, several large towns, including Junction City, Manhattan, Topeka—the State capital—Lawrence, and Kansas City, and a highly developed system of roads and railroads. The Milford and Perry Reservoirs are necessary to provide a large measure of flood protection for the rural area and small towns in this reach and together with the recommended local levee projects, are necessary to provide protection for the larger cities where damages are most concentrated. Milford Reservoir is of particular significance to protection for Junction City, Manhattan, and Topeka, and Perry Reservoir is of particular significance to protection for Lawrence and Kansas City.

Right now this area is experiencing its second year of drought. These drought conditions recur periodically as do floods and the consequences can be almost as severe. The committee in its study recognized the possibilities these reservoirs hold for minimizing both these effects.

The committee has also borne in mind, in recommending favorably on these reservoirs, that the Kansas River is part of the larger Missouri Basin problem and the effects of the reservoirs are needed for flood control and conservation on the lower Missouri as well as on the Kansas River.

The committee is strongly in favor of upstream development for soil conservation and appreciates the effects of such developments in conserving our soil, retarding runoff in normal rainfall and reducing flood damages on smaller streams. We are concerned here, however, with protection against major floods caused by severe and prolonged rainfall over large areas often falling on soils completely saturated by prior rains as in the disastrous 1951 flood. Experts are agreed that larger engineering works are necessary to achieve such protection. The committee is convinced that there are no acceptable alternates for the improvements now recommended for authorization in the Kansas River Basin and accordingly proposes that they be approved so that the program of flood control in this vital area can be continued.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret having to disagree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER]. I often agree with him, but in this particular case I believe him mistaken, honestly so of course, and certainly representing the people of his district to the very best of his ability.

We must have soil conservation, upstream dams, and reforestation as he said but also we must have big dams.

The district which it is my privilege to represent in Kansas City, Mo., was seriously damaged by the great flood of 1951. I believe that it is absolutely essential if this great metropolitan area which includes Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., as well as other cities and towns, is to have adequate protection from floods, that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] be defeated. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

I know of no project that has given more trouble to the Committee on Appropriations than the Missouri River. Every year we have about an equal number of people who come before us who are for the project and another group who are against appropriating the money for the project. Things got so bad that it seemed that everybody who came before us thought that he was an engineer.

I remember well when we were going to put the new roof on this building and remodel this room. I said on that occasion that I never knew we had so many engineers in the House of Representatives. This is another affair like that, but I want to tell you that when a Representative comes here from a district for the first time as a member of his party, and a member of the party that always held the district was defeated, and the defeated one was for this problem last time, it seems to me that the man who came here must have had at least the endorsement of the people whom he represents.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. These two dams now under discussion had nothing whatsoever to do with that election.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know whether they did or not, but I have been told that this one did. I have been told that it was the point at issue. I know from my own experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for a great number of years that this has been a very controversial subject. We ordered a special group of engineers to make a study of it the last time. When somebody says, "I don't want $16 million spent in my district," as a member of the Appropriations Committee I can hear that phrase.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 32, line 11, at the end thereof add the following: *"Provided,* That authorization or authorizations herein shall not include the projects described as Pomona Reservoir and Melvern Reservoir on the Osage River and described in said Document No. 549. 81st Congress."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to agree with everything that has been said of the horrible and sad situation concerning the floods at Kansas City and Topeka, Kans. Also at Ottawa, Kans. You can hardly overdescribe that terrible disaster that has been so well described and dramatized by those who have spoken before me. There are a number of other towns in our State where the people suffered almost as much as those already mentioned. Many heroic deeds were performed by the people of those towns. Not only that but it is almost unbelieveable how the people in these towns took hold, and with little or no assistance made such comeback that is almost a miracle. It is possible that flood controls or dams could have been of some assistance.

I should remind you that this amendment has nothing to do with the proposed projects on the Kansas River also known as the Kaw River. These projects in this amendment are near each other, are at the head of the Marais des Cygnes River. It does not flow near Kansas City. It empties, as I have told you, into the Missouri River near Jefferson City, Mo.

These 2 projects are 2 of 9 proposed projects on that stream and are at the head of it. As I have stated they are on a comparatively small stream. The stream does overflow at times. Much of the soil is eroding as it is doing in many places. Much of the land is rather flat. When there are floods the water spreads out in the valley.

Engineers differ in opinion as to amount of good that would be accomplished if these projects had been built when the 1951 flood occurred. They all agree the flooding of towns below would not have been prevented, but might have been lowered.

Without repeating too much of what I have said earlier, I feel you can withhold the authorization of this expenditure of $50 million until these people have been given a chance to develop the watershed and soil conservation program that is presently under way. It will continue in line with legislation recently approved by this Congress. Pilot projects are built and others are being built at the present time. They consist of a series of smaller reservoirs where the landowners share in the expense.

These projects are built under the supervision and approval of engineers of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I feel these landowners should be encouraged, not discouraged. I think also, we might give consideration to opinions of engineers of the Department of Agriculture. And, above all, give some consideration to the voices of 4,000 American citizens who are disturbed concerning our action here today.

Mr. Chairman, it will not injure your program to withhold these two comparatively small projects—but large to those involved—and let them be carefully examined after the present program, now under way, has been given a chance to function.

I agree there are many places where reservoirs should be built. These are, in my opinion, unique in character. Let us keep them out of this bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to oppose amendments that are proposed by one's friends. The Committee on Flood Control, however, is unanimously of the opinion that this project should be carried out as outlined in this bill. I represent here today the unanimous views of the subcommittee on flood control, including my own.

In 1938, the Army engineers suggested and the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives approved the construction of three dams in this area. These were the Oceola, the Pomme de Terre, and the South Grand. Objection was made by the State of Missouri to the construction of the Oceola Dam. As a result of these objections, a commission was created composed of representatives of the United States Army Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and the State of Missouri, with financial aid from the State of Kansas. This Commission made a survey of the whole situation in the Kansas-Osage Valley. The Commission issued a report proposing that nine dams be constructed to alleviate the floods in the Kansas and Osage River Basins. This proposal was unanimously approved by the Committee on Public Works. It is now submitted to the Congress by this committee. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is that 2 of the proposed 9 dams be taken out of the bill, the Pomona Dam, which would cost $12,900,000, and the Malvern Dam, which would cost $18,800,000. The Army engineers say that these nine dams are necessary to give flood-control protection in that region. They say that soil conservation work in the upper reaches of the river valleys will not give that area the needed protection. They say that these nine dams are absolutely essential.

The Committee on Public Works was convinced that the Army engineers were giving us good advice. The committee, by unanimous vote, has recommended the construction of these nine dams, together with flood protective works at two communities. We were told by the Army engineers that if we did not build these dams, the flood-control works around the towns would be of no value in providing them protection. So the committee recommends to the House today unanimously that this project of the nine dams as outlined by the Army engineers be approved. Therefore we recommend that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] be voted down.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, I dislike to take this time but I must point out that this is part of an integrated program. The town of Ottawa is affected more than the much smaller number of people in the district represented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who as in all other such cases will be well paid for any losses sustained by the construction of these dams. But in 40 years this town has been hit by 39 floods. They come any time of the year. There has been only one month in the year when we did not have a flood in this Marais des Cygnes River and that was the month of February. The Chinese say that one picture is better than a thousand words. These pictures will conserve time. I have here a picture of the flooded city of Ottawa. Twelve thousand people live there. The flood hit Ottawa at the same time as the big flood in the Kaw River, which, of course, overshadowed it. If it had not been for the bigger flood on the Kaw, this would have made national headlines. This picture shows that the stream was 5 miles wide. It was 52 feet deep. Do you think the smaller dams

will stop torrential floods which come down this valley year after year? Here is a picture taken showing Russell Crites, of Ottawa, and me standing on the dry rock bed of the Marais des Cygnes River 2 years after the flood. Not even a trickle is to be seen. This bridge you see was 9 feet under water. Had I been able to stand there at the peak of the flood I would have been 52 feet under water in that stream 5 miles wide. Here in this picture is a picture of the main downtown street in Ottawa. It is not only the city of Ottawa that is affected, but also the city of Osawatomie and the fertile fields of this valley. This program is the only salvation for those of us who live downstream and have to accept waters from the upper watersheds and the hillsides. Furthermore, after 3 years of serious drought, we know the need of storing flood waters for the days when the rains come not.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MOULDER. Is it not true that the damage caused by the annual floods in the Osage Basin amount to $5 million?

Mr. SCRIVNER. At least that. Of course, this 1951 flood itself ran many millions of dollars more than that.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does the gentleman realize that this plan in the bill adopts a much more modern and up-to-date program for that basin? If we accept this amendment we will continue in effect the authorization which is now out of date.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This is a modern program. The committee has done a good job in considering this. They looked at it from every angle, and this is their decision. It is a sound one. I trust the amendment will be defeated, so that we may have the protection from flood and drought that we so sorely need.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 41, line 3, strike out all of section 209.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the following language from the bill:

SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there shall be established in the civil works activities under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, 7 positions to be placed in grade GS-16 and 2 positions to be placed in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by that act.

It provides, you will see, without regard to limitation of the Classification Act, for 7 positions of supergrade 16 employees and 2 supergrade 17 employees. In other words, you ask that this agency go outside the limitations of the Classification Act and employ these additional people under supergrades.

After all, the House committee has jurisdiction of this class of legislation. This agency should know it. The matter of approving supergrades ought to be supervised by the Civil Service Commission. The legislation should remain with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Only recently our committee authorized 150 supergrade positions requested by the Civil Service Commission. The agency making the request should make its case with the Commission, and not ask your committee to approve.

If this present example is followed, other agencies will be doing the same thing. Then there will be no supervision at all.

This section should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. Chairman, this section (209) is in the bill at the request of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers handles hundred of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money every year. They represented to our committee that the best engineers of the country are no longer available to them because private industry and private business are hiring them by offering more money than the Government of the United States. In view of that fact, they represented to us that some of the best engineers they have had through the years have left them and have gone elsewhere.

If we expect the Corps of Engineers of this country and our Government to continue the splendid work they have done for more than 125 years, certainly they are entitled to have the personnel and the kind of people who can do the work entrusted to them. That is the reason section 209 is in the bill.

If you will notice, there are only about a half a dozen upgrades requested. It is not a large demand. Whether the Corps of Engineers and this committee have overstepped their jurisdiction is another question entirely. But those are the facts behind section 209. Unless the Corps of Engineers are given this higher classification so that they can pay a reasonable amount to men who are qualified to hold these high positions, they are going to find themselves without the personnel required to do the work entrusted to them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman realize the salaries that are being created, in the 17's for example, the salaries that go with that classification?

Mr. DONDERO. I am willing to listen to the gentleman, because he is more familiar with salaries than I am.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You are agreeing in this bill to pay these people up to $13,800 a year. They may be worth it. But if we are going to permit this committee and other committees to determine the number of classified people in 16's and 17's, I do not know where you are leading us to. That is my opinion, of course. If the House does not agree with me, very well. But it seems to me there ought to be some committee through which you funnel the number of people in these various classifications. That is the thing we have worked out and tried to perfect. Only last week after hearings we did increase the number by 150 in these classifications. Why not go to the Civil Service Commission, get their recommendation, and let that Commission come before the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It is the position of the gentleman from Kansas that the Corps of Engineers has come to the wrong committee; it should have gone to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not object if they want to go to the gentleman's committee, but I think this matter should be under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think the request of the Army engineers is unreasonable in this matter?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know; I have not heard their testimony. If they will come before us and give their testimony, we may determine it. I cannot find the gentleman's testimony, either.

Mr. DONDERO. The committee of which have the honor to be chairman did hear the testimony and determined, I think unanimously, that the request was reasonable and ought to be granted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's committee is one of the greatest committees in the whole Congress, I admit that.

Mr. DONDERO. We are proud of it, and I think the House is, too.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. I would like to back up the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think he has done an extraordinary job under very difficult conditions. We have found in the hearings we have held on reclassification of civil-service employees that this is a very perplexing problem.

As the chairman of the Civil Service Committee indicated, there are over 1,000 supergrades in the United States Government today. I think the proper place to get GS-16 and 17 classifications is before the Committee on Civil Service, and if the Corps of Army Engineers can back up what they want, the committee would give them a hearing in the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. If this were a large request, for a very large number, I could easily understand the gentleman's objections and also the objections of the chairman of the Civil Service Committee. But this is a small request.

Mr. BOLAND. The same argument used by the Corps of Engineers could be used by any other department of the Government. They all want supergrades. I think there ought to be a stop

to it, and this is the place to stop it right here.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas be defeated and that section 209 stay in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 65, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see H. R. 9859 before this august body here today for a vote. H. R. 9859 has had long hearings and careful study by the members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works. I want to compliment the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], for his fairness in all the hearings. Our committee is neither Republican nor Democrat. We leave our politics in the hallways outside of our committee rooms. No section of our great country has preference over another section of our country. The Committee on Public Works of the House is an all-American committee. I have served for many, many years on committees in my long legislative career, and I must say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is tops, a prince of good fellows. We, in the minority, were treated the same as the majority. I can say the same for our good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. He has done a real good job, worked hard and sincere; he has heard testimony for months and has always been fair. I am sorry that HOMER is not with us today. He is not feeling well enough.

All these things may be said for our good friend the gentleman from Washington, RUSSELL MACK, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. I think the gentleman from Washington, RUSSELL MACK, knows more about flood control than anybody in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to serve on the Committee on Public Works of the House. They are all fine fellows; and I include the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. BUCHANAN], too. They should be complimented for their good, hard work in presenting this bill, H. R. 9859, for consideration today. I hope the bill passes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 32, line 2, immediately before the word "at", insert "exclusive of the Milford Dam."

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think we can make very short work of this dam. The amount is only $38 million and we cannot afford to spend too much time on that small sum. I had been informed and believed for some time that this was an economy-minded Congress. I am not quite so sure of it now.

I do want to pay a little attention to some of the remarks that were made concerning the amendment that I presented here a few minutes ago, the amendment to strike out Perry Dam. The statement was made that there was several hundred million dollars of damage at Kansas City and Topeka, and that is true. But we are not so sure that the construction of these dams would remedy that situation.

Let me read to you from the report of the board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas to look into the Kansas River situation. This report was signed by three of the best engineers of nationwide reputation who had made a very thorough study of this entire Kaw River Basin. This is the conclusion to which they came:

Had all the 18 dams authorized or recommended including Milford and Perry been completed and operating as designed, the 1951 flood would have overtopped all the urban protection works from Manhattan to the Missouri River by from 1 to 3 feet and the damage in those areas would have been great. The cost of this program, including channels, would have been $400 million.

What becomes of your argument that the construction of Perry Dam and Milford Dam would relieve that situation when three of the best engineer in the country say that if they had been there this flood, the like of which we wish to protect against would have overtopped them all by several feet? You would have had just as great a flood as you did have. So your argument has gone down the river. Does it make good sense for this Congress to appropriate funds and initiate a program of flood prevention upstream and at the same time, while we are doing that, on the same river basin, going down to the end of the river, to the mouth of the river, and throwing across a dam that is proposed to do the very thing we are doing upstream? They tell us that it cannot be done, that it will not be effective.

Is it not true that every watershed is composed of subwatersheds, and if you can control the floods on the river, can you not control them all the more easily on the creeks? That is what we are doing. The river basin is only the sum of the creek basins that go to make it up.

I will not take any more of your time this evening. I do not know what you are going to do but I have a pretty good idea.

Before I leave I want to say this: The assertion was made here that these two river dams had no relationship to Tuttle Creek Dam. They did have a relationship. These people came to me in the last campaign and they voted for me because, they said: "If they authorize or appropriate for Tuttle Creek we will be next." You are proving it to them today. They are next.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I debated at great length the merits of the Perry Dam with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER]. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] had moved that the Perry Dam be stricken from the bill. The Milford Dam is similar to the Perry Dam. It serves the same purposes. Inasmuch as a majority earlier stood by the committee in keeping the Perry Dam in the bill, we hope for the same reason they will keep the Milford Dam in the bill. I call for a vote on the amendment. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, of the many worthwhile projects included in this omnibus bill—H. R. 9859—now before us, there is one in particular which I feel warrants special attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

This is the second item enumerated in the bill and deals with the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire.

Our great Portsmouth Naval Base which is extremely vital to the national defense lies at the mouth of the Piscataqua River (the lower portion of the river is known as Portsmouth Harbor). Except for three rock ledges which this project seeks to remove, the Piscataqua River would be a deep draft navigable stream approximately 13 miles upstream from the Portsmouth Naval Base. Today the vessels stopping at this great naval base must be exceedingly cautious and careful because of the first of the three rock ledges.

As the Committee on Public Works stated in House Report 2247:

Particularly hazardous navigational difficulties prevail at the three submerged ledges at which improvements are recommended. Their removal would permit safer navigation and maneuvering, particularly for deep draft vessels of 10,000 tons or more.

The House Public Works Committee thoroughly inspected the Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River last August. It is my sincere belief that this is one of the most worthwhile and deserving projects we visited.

Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River has a natural channel 70 feet deep in places and at the shallow points about 40 feet.

The amount asked for in the bill for Portsmouth is $952,000 and the point I wish to emphasize is that the improvements in the harbor and the Piscataqua River will be permanent. This harbor never freezes. There is no silting because of the swiftness of the river. Once the rock obstructions are removed, nothing more needs to be done. The harbor is protected and easily accessible. With the removal of these rocks the large tankers and the largest boats used in coastwise shipping would have an easy access to the harbor and the river.

After listening to evidence presented from various witnesses and the United States Corps of Engineers in connection with this project, and after personally inspecting the harbor, I am thoroughly convinced that the States of Maine and New Hampshire need these improvements and I am certain that tremendous economic development will follow the completion of the project. There is

illimitable opportunity for marked industrial development. This I am sure would follow if boats could go in and out without being damaged.

When we reflect that the New England taxpayers have helped to provide the billions of dollars appropriated by the Congress for the subsidization of electric power in other sections of the country, this item of $952,000 seems small indeed compared to the economic stability and well-being which this project will help to create. It will help to offset the previous migration of industries from this New England area to those which have been provided with federally subsidized electric power. It will enhance the growing and expanding economy of our Nation as well as providing for the national defense of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire's First Congressional District, Representative CHESTER E. MERROW is to be complimented for his active and intelligent leadership in bringing this important matter to the attention of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and later to the attention of the whole committee. Congressman MERROW has served his congressional district for six terms. It was largely because of his work and concerted effort that the Committee on Public Works visited the Granite State. Both as host to the committee last summer when visiting his district, and on his several appearances before sessions of the House Public Works Committee, he has proved to be a splendid Representative of New Hampshire and a great statesman. He has always held to the pertinent facts in his persevering campaign for this great project. I am delighted for him, for his district, and the Nation that this project will become a reality—it will long remain a great monument to him.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on its approval of the project in the sum of $8½ million for the deepening of the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River.

The 40-foot channel which now exists there had been adequate in the past years, but with the increase in the size of shipping, it has become quite inadequate in recent years. The port of Portland carries a tremenduous load of shipping and is constantly growing. Without the improvement of the river bar, much of this future growth might be stunted.

It is a worthwhile project, and one which I am sure the House as a whole will approve.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the coastline of the Second Congressional District of Washington is said to be the longest of that of any district in the United States. Because of this and other natural phenomena, the maritime industries of shipping, boatbuilding, and fisheries are of extreme importance to the economic life of the area.

Puget Sound, a major portion of which is within my district, is favored by many fine natural harbors. Its waters are teeming with food fish, chief among which is the mighty salmon. For this reason commercial fishing has long been a major source of income for many of our citizens. In 1953 over $19 million was realized from the sale of their catch. Fish processing plants are located in nearly every community on its shores. These plants provide employment for thousands.

Safe and adequate moorage is essential if maritime industries are to be pursued efficiently and profitably. Good harbors are one of our valuable natural resources and they must be developed and maintained for the good of all of our people.

One of the chief deterrents to the orderly growth of the shipping and fisheries industries of Puget Sound has been the shameful neglect that has been apparent for many years in the development of its harbors.

The improvement of our harbors is a long-drawn-out process which requires much planning and foresight if it is to be carried out successfully. During the 20 years of the previous administration, during which it seemed that money was available for almost any purpose; during which our national debt rose from $21 billion to $265 billion despite the collection of the highest taxes in our national history; and despite the emphasis throughout the land of natural resource development, precious little was done toward improving the fine harbors of the Second Congressional District of Washington. Few if any major harbor projects there were even authorized during that period. Local interests have done and are continuing to do everything possible to accommodate the growing needs for space and accommodations but have been unable to keep up with the demand.

The House Committee on Public Works of this 83d Congress proposes now to do something about this situation which has been neglected for so long a time. They have recommended the authorization of improvement and development projects for eight harbors on Puget Sound, from Shilshole on the southern edge of my district to Everett, Bellingham, and Blaine on the Canadian border to the north. To the west is Cap Sante at Anacortes, then Port Angeles, and at the extreme northwesterly tip of the United States, on either side of Cape Flattery, is Neah Bay and Quillayute Harbor.

I sincerely commend the members of the Public Works Committee for their diligence in studying these proposed projects. During my many appearances before them, I was treated with great courtesy and patience. They have examined carefully the facts and figures in each individual case and have arrived at an intelligent and well-reasoned decision regarding all of them. I congratulate them and urge that this body concur in their recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, 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. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 643, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk is authorized to correct section numbers.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to exend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6080) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, 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 7, after "Columbia" insert "for credit to the Highway Fund."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "not to exceed $475,000" and insert "the sum of $290,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE GOLD COAST AND NIGERIA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 648) to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward independence and self-government truly expressive of the desires of the people and as they show their capability to establish and protect free institutions; and

Whereas the Continent of Africa is a vital part of the free world area; and

Whereas a revised constitution of the Gold Coast was approved on April 29, 1954, and the first formal meeting of the legislature of that territory under this constitution will take place on July 29, 1954; and

Whereas a revised constitution of Nigeria is expected to be approved during August 1954, and the first meeting of the federal legislature of that territory under this constitution is expected to take place shortly thereafter; and

Whereas these occasions mark important milestones in their progress toward self-government and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under the revised constitutions, in recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the United States and those territories, and in reaffirmation of the friendship of the United States for the peoples of Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete self-government for these territories.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution extends on behalf of the House of Representatives its most cordial greetings to the legislative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under their revised constitution, and in addition authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete self-government for these territories.

On April 29, 1954, a new constitution was approved for the Gold Coast which brings it to the threshold of sovereign independence. Under it an all-African government with almost complete responsibility for the country's internal affairs has been established. Elections based on universal adult suffrage were held June 10–15, 1954, under the new constitution: The Convention People's Party won 72 of the 104 seats of the new legislative assembly and, on June 17, 1954, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, chairman of the Convention People's Party accepted the offer of the Gold Coast Governor to become Prime Minister and to form a new government. The Prime Minister, educated at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, was the first African ever to hold such office in any British territory.

Similarly in Nigeria, the largest of the United Kingdom territories with a population of 31.5 million, a revised federal constitution representing the will of the people as expressed through their leaders is expected to be approved next month. The new constitution will give the 3 regions of Nigeria greater autonomy and will carry 2 of the 3 regions a considerable way toward self-government. Supplementing these moves toward independence, the United Kingdom has declared that in 1956 they will be prepared to grant full self-government to any region that may wish it in respect to those subjects that are a regional responsibility. Nnamdi Azikwe, who recently visited the United States, will become Prime Minister of the eastern region. Like his Gold Coast counterpart, he, too, is an alumnus of Lincoln University and a respected leader of nationalist movements throughout western Africa.

Our Nation's policy encourages legitimate efforts toward independence and self-government among those peoples in former colonial and underdeveloped areas who demonstrate a desire and a capacity to establish and protect free institutions. Accordingly, official cognizance should be taken of the momentous events that are now happening in western Africa. At a time when man's natural will to be free is thwarted in many parts of the world by the subversion practiced by Communists under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist regime, the significance of recent developments in the Gold Coast and Nigeria looms very large for the free world's success.

Since the British acquisition of the territories now comprising the Gold Coast and Nigeria during the 19th century, vast changes have been wrought there. From primitive tribal cultures these territories have now advanced to a degree of social and political maturity that should soon allow them to assume their rightful places among the free nations of the world.

It is entirely fitting that the House of Representatives should extend its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria upon the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under their revised constitutions, and that the Secretary of State be requested to appoint a delegation to represent the United States at the ceremonies which will mark the achievement of complete independence for these territories. Such acts are fitting recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the United States and these areas and are a reaffirmation of the friendship of the United States for the peoples of Africa.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, when the bill H. R. 9757 was before the House today, I voted against the motion to recommit. However, I was absent during the rollcall on the final passage and if I had been present, I would have voted for the bill.

RE-REFERENCE OF BILLS TO COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bills 3655, 3506, and 1585 be re-referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. REED of New York submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States and for other purposes.

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS WATER DIVERSION PROJECT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizing the construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project, H. R. 236, is now pending on the House Calendar. There is widespread interest in this legislation in Colorado and I wish to call attention to the different agencies and States that have approved this project. I submit herewith a list of the agencies that have given official approval to this project. I wish to call special attention to the fact that the project has been approved by all of the States in the Colorado River Basin, including the State of California, which is now offering some objections.

The list follows:

Fryingpan-Arkansas project has official approval of:

Secretary of the Interior.

Bureau of Reclamation.

Colorado River Basin States, including Colorado, California, Arizona, Nevada, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico.

Following affected States and agencies:

Kansas.

Oklahoma.

Secretary of the Army.

Department of Agriculture.

Department of Commerce.

Federal Power Commission.

Corps of Army Engineers.

Public Health Service.

Arkansas River Compact Administration.

Colorado Water Conservation Board.

Southwestern Conservation District of Colorado.

Colorado River Water Conservation District of Colorado.

Colorado Game and Fish Commission.

Leeds-Hill and Jewett, consulting engineers, Los Angeles, Calif., in Special Report on Depletion of Colorado Surface Water Supplies, dated October 31, 1953, page 54; "A bill is now before Congress to authorize construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, which would involve the diversion of about 72,000 acre-feet annually from Fryingpan Creek, a tributary of Roaring Fork, into the headwaters of Arkansas River. This would be physically feasible."

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to submit a list of the local groups which have expressed their approval of this project. On this list we find a number of REA cooperatives, who are interested in obtaining cheaper power. We also find the Public Service Co. of Colorado, and the Southern Colorado Power Co. of Pueblo, Colo., which are the large private utilities serving this area. There is no controversy over the power that will be developed by this project and there is a ready market for the same.

On this list we find a number of ditch companies in the Arkansas Valley who are in need of supplemental water. Also, a number of soil-conservation districts who are vitally interested in this project. Also, a number of labor organizations who are urging the construction of this project.

Included on this list is a number of cities and towns in Colorado, some of whom will obtain badly needed domestic water from the project. In addition, there is a large group of service clubs and similar organizations who have expressed interest in the project and are desirous of having the same constructed. The following is but a partial list of the many groups which have indicated their approval of this legislation:

Fryingpan-Arkansas project has been endorsed by:

Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado.

Southeast Colorado Power Association (REA).

Colorado State Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives.

San Isabel Electric Association, Pueblo (REA).

Sangre de Cristo Electric Association, Salida (REA).

San Luis Valley REA, Colorado.

Public Service Co. of Colorado, Denver.

Southern Colorado Power Co., Pueblo.

Soil conservation districts of southeastern Colorado.

Upper Arkansas Soil Conservation District.

Colorado Soil Conservation Association.

Fort Lyon Canal Co., Las Animas, Colo.

Catlin Canal Co., Rocky Ford, Colo.

Arkansas Valley Ditch Association, Colorado.

Mutual Ditch Co., Rocky Ford, Colo.

Otero Canal Co., Rocky Ford, Colo.

Rocky Ford Highline Ditch Co., Colorado.

Oxford Farmers Ditch Co., Colorado.

Holbrook Ditch Co., Colorado.

United Steel Workers of America, CIO, Pueblo.

Colorado State CIO Council, Denver.

Colorado State Federation of Labor, Denver.

Pueblo Building Trades Council, AFL.

Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Pueblo.

Colorado State Industrial Union Council, Denver.

Following Colorado cities and towns: Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Leadville, Buena Vista, Salida, Canon City, Florence, Fowler, Manzanola, Rocky Ford, La Junta, Las Animas, Lamar, Eads, and Walsenburg.

Municipal Water Districts, Pueblo.

Chambers of commerce of cities listed above.

Service clubs and professional organizations of above cities.

Farm Bureau of Las Animas, Colo.

Farmers Union, Bent County, Las Animas, Colo.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION, 1955

Mr. NICHOLSON from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 686, Rept. No. 2528) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 10051) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the following amendment: On page 3, line 2, strike out "$70 million" and in lieu thereof insert "$45 million" and after line 2, page 3, insert a new paragraph as follows: "For special assistance in joint control areas in Europe, $25 million." At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LABELING OF PACKAGES CONTAINING FOREIGN-PRODUCED TROUT SOLD IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NICHOLSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 687, Rept. No. 2529), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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 (S. 2033) relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE NICKEL SHORTAGE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 I addressed the House on the subject of the nickel shortage and indicated that through the House Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, we were attempting to obtain the information which would be helpful in determining why the many members of the plating industry in this country were being allocated a disproportionately small amount of nickel. At that time I stated that—

When a material such as nickel is the economic life's blood of so many small businesses in our country, it is essential that its allocation be made on a fair and equitable basis.

Since that time the House Committee on Small Business has been continuing its investigation and has been unable to obtain specific answers to the specific questions that have been troubling us. It was for that reason that the committee on July 23 addressed the following letter to Mr. H. B. McCoy, Deputy Administrator of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1954.

Mr. H. B. MCCOY,
Deputy Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCOY: This is in reference to your letter of May 6, 1954, in response to this committee's inquiry concerning the distribution of nickel.

Since we have concluded that additional information is required in our investigation of this matter, we are submitting further questions, the answer to which we hope will focus attention on the nature and scope of the complaints small job platers have presented to this committee. These questions are listed below:

1. In response to our previous question concerning the conservation of nickel in specific defense production programs, the answer was supplied that "the Department of Defense has under way a very active nickel conservation program directed toward conserving nickel wherever possible in its current program." What office in the Department of Defense is specifically responsible for carrying out this program and what rela-

tionship has been established between this office and the Business and Defense Services Administration? If there is no formal relationship, is it not regarded important that BDSA, as the official agency of Government coordinating business and defense activities, should stimulate conservation through close liaison with the Department of Defense to insure that nickel is not used unnecessarily in defense purchases?

2. In your letter of May 6, 1954, you included a statement from the International Nickel Co. describing the procedure through which nickel is being allocated to industry. However, since the immediate source of nickel for small platers is not the International Nickel Co. but a small group of distributing firms, what procedures do these concerns follow in furnishing supplies for nondefense production? Allegations have been made to this committee that these distributing companies do not supply all nickel anodes for electroplating. In order to make a proper evaluation of published statistics, are these allegations correct?

3. Since it is our understanding that a percentage of a given base period is used in the distribution of nickel, what is the base period percentage allowed platers for nondefense production from the elimination of use restrictions in November 1953 to the third quarter of 1954? Does the identical base period percentage apply to all industrial plating operations, large and small, and is the percentage the same in given months for all suppliers?

4. The Bureau of Mines reports that nickel anodes consumed by electroplaters in the United States in 1950 amounted to 34,847,601 pounds. In 1953, 28,531,923 pounds were consumed. This represents a reduction of approximately 19 percent in the amount of nickel used by this industry. Since, in general, base periods reflect maximum supplies obtained during 3 optional 6-month periods in 1949 and 1950, how do you account for reductions ranging from 60 to 70 percent as reported by the job-plating industry?

5. What amount of nickel was allocated by INC to suppliers in 1953 and as compared with 1950?

6. According to your previous statement, you indicated that "very little nickel is going into new business," and that "new businesses are generally treated as small users where the supplier can within the limits of nickel available to him meet some of these demands." In view of these statements, how do you account for the current establishment of reported new and expanded large-scale plating facilities by the automobile industry and its component suppliers? Facilities recently and currently established by the following companies are illustrative: (a) Truck and coach division, General Motors Corp.; (b) Cadillac division, General Motors Corp.; (c) Ryerson & Haynes Co., Jackson, Mich.; (d) Douglas & Lomason Co., Detroit, Mich.; (e) Vinco-Parker Wolverine Co., Detroit, Mich.; (f) A. C. spark plug division, General Motors Corp., Flint, Mich.; (g) Oldsmobile division, General Motors Corp., Lansing, Mich.; (h) Pontiac division, General Motors Corp., Pontiac Mich., and (i) Brown-Lipe-Chapin division, General Motors Corp., Elyria, Ohio.

7. In view of the stringency of the nickel shortage for the indefinite future and the policy of extremely limited supplies available to new users, it would appear that shortages or uncertain supplies of nickel would deter the purchase of new equipment or expansion of present facilities. Therefore, are nickel supplies for the operation of such new facilities furnished by the International Nickel Co. or its distributing firms? If so, how is this justified in view of the existing policies relating to the base period distribution system and new users?

8. What firms in the United States are primary sellers of new nickel plating equipment and facilities? Is there any relationship between the sales of new equipment by specific firms and the distribution of nickel supplies by the same firm? In cases where nickel suppliers are also involved in the sale of new plating equipment, how do the monthly base period allocations (since November 1953) to platers compare with the base period percentages allowed by other nickel distributors not concerned with equipment sales?

The committee requests full and complete replies to these questions. It is our belief that the issues involved here are within the area of legitimate concern of your agency as evidenced by the general concern of BDSA and Office of Defense Mobilization officials that equitable distribution of available nickel to nondefense users must be assured. We request further that this information be furnished without delay.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation for your courtesy in this matter.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Chairman.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that with nickel in such short supply, we must protect the many small businesses that depend upon the supply of nickel for their existence. I trust the Department of Commerce will cooperate fully in obtaining complete answers to the questions set forth in the committee's letter.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN] is recnized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERNÓs-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the people of Puerto Rico joyfully celebrated the second anniversary of the inauguration of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This marked, also, the 56th anniversary of the first landing of the United States troops in Puerto Rico. Fifty-six years ago the ship of Puerto Rican history set compass towards the port of full self-government within the American political system. It reached port 2 years ago.

One might ask, What does Commonwealth status mean? In what sense is the term used in the case of Puerto Rico?

Commonwealth is a word of Anglo-Saxon derivation. Etymologically, it is equivalent to republic, a word of Latin extraction. The concept is the same—Res publica: The common thing, the common value, the common interest, the common wealth.

However, changes in the use of the word "commonwealth" and the word "republic" have taken place in the course of time. Originally in England, with Cromwell, commonwealth was used to mean government by the representatives of the people, by the parliament, as opposed to government by the King, a power superior to the people. In France, with the revolution, "republic" was similarly used to mean government by the people, as opposed to government by the King. In American history, with the organization of the Commonwealths of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, commonwealth meant a government created by the people, administered by the representatives of the people, and with no sovereign other than the people. "Republic" was used in the same sense with the creation of the Union.

But in modern British history, the symbol of the Crown has been retained when commonwealth has been used for the Commonwealths of Australia and of New Zealand. And in recent American history, it was used for the Philippine Islands, before they became independent. In both instances, the term still meant free peoples, but not necessarily separate republics.

The Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico was entrusted with the task of organizing the people of Puerto Rico into a self-governing body politic, and creating a government for that body politic. The government was to be republican in form; with ultimate authority vested in the people. But the body politic was not to be constituted as an independent republic. It was to live in continued association with the United States, under the terms of a compact embodied in a law enacted by the Congress, and accepted by the people of Puerto Rico, albeit Puerto Rico was not to be admitted into the Union of States.

It was something new in the political system of the United States, as in 1803 it was new to add territory to the Union and treat it as the original Territory of the Northwest; just as it was new in 1899 for the United States to acquire, under the treatymaking power, sovereignty over territories not incorporated into the United States, as all former acquisitions had been; as it was new in 1917 with the Jones Act, the second Organic Act of Puerto Rico, to declare the citizens of an unincorporated body politic, United States citizens. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is, in fact, the natural outgrowth of the new concept of the unincorporated territory as defined by the Supreme Court in the early part of the century, in the famous Insular cases, and of the precedent established in 1917 with the declaration of United States citizenship for the people of an unincorporated territory. It is a new line of political development in the United States political system, parallel with, but distinct from that followed by incorporated territories which were later admitted as member States.

The Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, by Resolution 22, declared its interpretation of the new concept. Resolution 22 reads, in part:

> Whereas the word "commonwealth" in contemporary English usage means a politically organized community, that is to say, a state (using the word in the generic sense) in which political power resides ultimately in the people, hence a free state, but one which is at the same time linked to a broader political system in a federal or other type of association and therefore does not have an independent and separate existence; and
>
> Whereas the single word "commonwealth," as currently used, clearly defines the status of the body politic created under the terms of the compact existing between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States, i. e., that of a state which is free of superior authority in the management of its own local affairs, but which is linked to the United States of America and hence is a part of its political system, in a manner compatible with its federal structure.

Mr. Speaker, the foundation of the association of the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico to the United States is our common loyalty to our common citizenship. This includes the duty to support the Constitution and laws of the United States and in giving this support offer the last full measure of devotion.

How do the people of Puerto Rico feel about the Commonwealth? The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was inaugurated on July 25, 1952. It is now 2 years old.

On November of that same year, in the general elections we selected our government officials and legislators, under the constitution of the Commonwealth.

Three political parties placed candidates into the field. Each took a stand as to the interpretation of the Commonwealth status and the future of the people of Puerto Rico within that status.

One party squarely supported the concept of commonwealth. Another, charging that it was colonialism in disguise, advocated separation, discontinuance of association with the United States, and the establishment of an independent republic. A third alleged that statehood was the only acceptable form of self-government for the United States citizens of Puerto Rico.

Then the people spoke.

The party supporting the Commonwealth received 430,000 votes, the party advocating separation 125,000 votes, and the party asking for statehood 84,000 votes.

This was the verdict of the people. With their support, Puerto Rico has bloomed under the able leadership of a great American and the leader of the Puerto Rican people, Luis Muñoz-Marin, the chief architect and the moving spirit of the Commonwealth.

The people of Puerto Rico have proved they are politically mature. They are not going to be stampeded into suicide and jump through the separatist window into the turmoil of today's international struggle, nor will they break their backs trying to carry burdens and assume financial responsibilities for which they lack the necessary strength. Much less will they countenance the deed of the lunatics, guided by fantasies and nightmares leading to unspeakable aberrations and crimes. The terms of association may change, by common agreement, as the Commonwealth grows, but the association is here to stay. It is, let us hope and let us affirm, permanent association.

The question has been asked: Is Puerto Rico an asset or a liability to the United States? I have heard so much one way and the other, that I believe it is time to look at the facts.

Puerto Rico contributes only in a very limited way to the support of the Federal Government. United States income tax laws apply in Puerto Rico only on income derived by the citizens of the Commonwealth from sources outside of Puerto Rico, including Federal salaries. Last year this amounted to about $8,600,000. The inhabitants of Puerto Rico are free of other Federal taxes. But it is one thing not to be taxed or lightly taxed, and another to live on a dole. The government of Puerto Rico does not receive United States tax money for its support. The Commonwealth government is maintained only by taxes paid by the Puerto Rican people.

Allow me to recall that taxes paid in Puerto Rico fall into two categories; namely, those paid under laws of the Commonwealth and those paid under the terms of the compact, within which the Commonwealth was created.

Agreed to under compact are the import duties on foreign imports. Such duties prevail in Puerto Rico at the same rates as in the United States on foreign imports under Federal laws. Also agreed to are the countervailing taxes collected on merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States. Such taxes must be paid at the same rates as internal revenue taxes are paid in the United States on like articles of domestic merchandise. Both, custom duties and countervailing taxes, are paid by the citizens of Puerto Rico and are covered into the treasury of the Commonwealth.

However, independently from the government of the Commonwealth, Federal agencies operate in Puerto Rico. Their expenses are paid by the Federal Government as are expenses of Federal functions in the States. The most considerable of these is the Defense Establishment.

Then, joint programs of varied nature are carried out in Puerto Rico with funds contributed both by the Federal and the Commonwealth Governments on a matching basis. Such joint programs are conducted in Puerto Rico under the same laws, rules, and regulations as in the States and for the same purposes. Both are in the local-national interest.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico occupies the center of the arc of islands that curves from the tip of Florida to the northern coast of Venezuela. It is 1,100 air miles from the Panama Canal. It commands the air approaches from South America to the United States. It is the United States bastion in the Caribbean.

Puerto Rico is the fourth best customer of the United States in the New World. Only Canada, Mexico, and Venezuela exceed Puerto Rico's purchases. In 1953, we bought $471 million in goods from the States.

Tariff barriers between United States and Puerto Rico are nonexistent. However, we are limited in the amount of refined sugar we may sell in the mainland, while the States are not so limited in interstate commerce.

Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States. Similarly, after a year of residence, any citizen of the United States automatically becomes a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Most important of all: Puerto Rico is the only community of American citizens comprised almost exclusively of Spanish-Americans. It is the only former colony of Spain which, upon separation from the mother country, did not become independent but rather associated with the United States. As such, it has become a graphic illustration of how a Spanish-American country can develop in peace and freedom in close association with the United States.

Puerto Rico is a small island with a large population. It necessarily depends largely on external commerce. Membership in the best-developed and soundest economic system in the world is its economic life's blood. Sugar is its economic backbone. Access to the United States sugar market as a domestic partner allows Puerto Rico's sugar industry to flourish.

Industrialization in many directions is now taking place. Separation would be economically fatal to Puerto Rico, and a depressed economy would not allow a peaceful society in Puerto Rico as anywhere.

At the inception of point 4 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico offered itself as a proving ground for those who would obtain technical knowledge to take back to their respective countries for evaluation and development. To date nearly 1,500 persons coming from every country of the world have visited Puerto Rico to observe various aspects of our development program. The Commonwealth has just negotiated with the Foreign Operations Administration a 3-year agreement under which 600 persons each year will come to Puerto Rico for training or observation for the next 3 years, at a cost of some $200,000 a year. Approximately one-half of this amount will be borne by the Commonwealth government. Gov. Harold Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, recently said of this program in a letter to Governor Muñoz-Marín:

> I am deeply impressed with the contribution Puerto Rico has been making to this aspect of American foreign policy and most appreciative of the interest and leadership which you have personally devoted to this activity. As you indicate, Puerto Rico has a special competence in the technical cooperation field and the Commonwealth is a living demonstration of the values of the democratic approach to the improvement of the standard of living of its people.

In sum, I believe, rather than determine whether Puerto Rico is a liability or an asset, we might better affirm that the association of Puerto Rico with the United States is mutually beneficial.

For 50 years an experiment in democracy has been in progress in Puerto Rico beneath the Star Spangled Banner. Totalitarianism to right or left, dictatorship, or autocracy may rear up elsewhere in the world, but not in Puerto Rico, where freedom is safe, solid, and pure and simple. Such is the daily spiritual bread of its citizens. Puerto Rico stands as a shining example of how very well American ideals and ways of life may take root in a fertile, loyal Spanish-American community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to address this great legislative body representing the free people of the United States and to express, on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico, who elected me, their sincere appreciation for the action which was taken here to make it possible for them to organize their constitutional government which gave them self-rule. One has only to observe what is going on in other parts of the world to realize what a great privilege this is.

I express my conviction that the very friendly and mutually beneficial relations between the United States and Puerto Rico may be characterized in the future, as in the past, by a two-way street of good will and enduring friend-

ship under such conditions as will allow Puerto Rico to develop into a golden asset in order that, as a Commonwealth, with membership in the greatest political system on earth, it may increasingly contribute to the common effort and help to maintain the leadership of the United States in showing the way for all people who want to be free.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly some of our veterans' legislation. We have spent hours and hours and hours debating other legislation but I see a tendency today to do away with our veterans' special legislation and have social security take over.

This is much more serious than I think anyone here realizes and would be a great tragedy to the veterans.

The gentlewoman from Michigan, Judge THOMPSON, has wanted to ask me certain questions regarding veterans' legislation. She and I have both been busy with hearings and long sessions of the Congress. She has been waiting for several days to do so. I know she wanted to ask me about H. R. 9020. That bill that last Wednesday a week ago passed the House very much modified from the bill reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. As reported, the bill gave roughly a 10 percent increase in compensation across the board to service-connected cases. This was changed to a 5 percent increase to all service-connected cases. That part of the original H. R. 9020 giving an increase from 12 percent to 25 percent to the widows and dependents of service-connected veterans was kept in the bill that passed the House.

Section 3, the part of the bill which would have given increase in pension to the permanently disabled and those not able to work and to Spanish-American War widows, and benefits to those of certain other wars, was taken out of the bill. We were told that if we did not take out that section of the bill there would be a Presidential veto. Personally, I doubt very much if the President, when the time came, would have vetoed that measure even if it was said that he would. I feel sure that he would not have vetoed it. But that is out. The bill is in the Senate now as we passed it without section 3, and the Committee on Finance reported it out unanimously a short while ago.

Also, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, I hear, will report out an extension of the GI training bill for Korean veterans and those who were in hospitals and were unable to take GI training. That includes World War II hospitalized veterans, and will also report out favorably a bill which will give increased amounts of pay to soldiers' homes for veteran patients. They have been very much limited in the soldiers' homes for budgetary reasons as the soldiers' homes could not afford to take them. I say to the lady from Michigan that a Michigan soldiers' home instead of receiving $500 now would get $700 per veteran patient.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I wish to commend the gentlewoman and to thank her for the information she has given me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state to the gentlewoman that I believe she does not realize the inspiration she has been in all veterans' work in the Congress. The veterans know that Judge THOMPSON will vote for the veterans; whether it be a voice vote, a letter vote, or a record vote, she is always willing to be counted. I know of her work in Michigan, when she was a judge for many years. I know of the personal kindnesses she performed for the people whose cases she judged. She helped hundreds of families with their problems. I know of her work abroad for years with the armed services in World War II. And I know of the enormous amount of welfare work she did at that time during World War II in the legal department of the Army in Germany. She has constantly worked for the veterans, and she has consistently voted for the veterans. It is not just lipservice with her. Her life has been one of service and self-denial to them as it has been to her State and to the Nation. It has been real action, it has been help we needed tremendously. I have a very great admiration for her legal mind, her high principles and for her work as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. She is as modest as she is able. I value her opinions so much. She shows great courage in her votes. She is highly respected and beloved in the Congress.

The following is the status of some of the veterans' bills in the House and in the Senate which may prove useful to the veterans of Michigan:

Passed the House and is now in the Committee on Finance of the Senate:

INCREASED RATES OF COMPENSATION, H. R. 9020

Title: To provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation payable to certain veterans and their dependents. Mr. RADWAN. Introduced and referred May 5, 1954.

Analysis: Provides the increases in service-connected compensation as indicated in the tables which follow:

Veterans' compensation—All wars and peacetime

	Present law war service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. I	H. R. 9020	Present law peacetime service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. II	H. R. 9020
(a) 10 percent disability	$15.75	$17.00	$12.60	$14.00
(b) 20 percent disability	31.50	33.00	25.20	26.00
(c) 30 percent disability	47.25	50.00	37.80	40.00
(d) 40 percent disability	63.00	66.00	50.40	53.00
(e) 50 percent disability	86.25	91.00	69.00	73.00
(f) 60 percent disability	103.50	109.00	82.80	87.00
(g) 70 percent disability	120.75	127.00	96.60	102.00
(h) 80 percent disability	138.00	145.00	110.40	116.00
(i) 90 percent disability	155.25	163.00	124.20	130.00
(j) Total disability	172.50	181.00	138.00	145.00
(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (f) increased monthly by	47.00	47.00	37.60	37.60
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	[1] 47.00	[1] 47.00	[2] 37.60	[2] 37.60
(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	266.00	279.00	212.80	223.00
(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	313.00	329.00	250.40	263.00
(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	353.00	371.00	282.40	297.00
(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation	400.00	420.00	320.00	336.00
(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	400.00	420.00	320.00	336.00
(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67.00	67.00	53.60	53.60

[1] But in no event to exceed $420. [2] But in no event to exceed $336.

Section 2 increases the rate of compensation for widows without children from $75 to $87 monthly. Dependent parents are increased from $60 to $75 and where 2 parents are living from $35 to $40 each.

Reported in House, May 28, 1954; House Report No. 1685.

Passed House, July 21, 1954, 399 yeas to 0 nays, 1 "present" (under suspension of rules). (Pending before Senate Finance Committee.)

	Cost	Korea	World War II	World War I	Spanish War	Regular		Tota
						Wartime	Peacetime	
Veterans	$60, 045, 000	135, 800	1, 623, 700	213, 100	400	1, 500	61, 900	2, 036, 000
Widows	9, 722, 000	3, 300	26, 400	31, 700	975	325	6, 000	68, 700
Parents	40, 087, 000	19, 100	194, 400	20, 400	20	1, 480	7, 300	242, 700
Total	109, 854, 000							

Passed the House and is now before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate:

EXTENDING TIME FOR INITIATING COURSES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 550, H. R. 9888

Title: To amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered. Mr. SPRINGER. Introduced and referred July 13, 1954.

Analysis: Extends time for starting courses of education and training under Public Law 550 (Korean GI bill of rights) by making initiation date 3 (now 2) years after discharge, 8 (now 7) years after discharge for completion of course. Grants trainees under Public Law 16 (service connected) who have been prevented from initiating or completing training by reason of disability or by correction of type of discharge, 4 additional years to complete course.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"As will be recalled, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which provided benefits for veterans of the Korean service period in the same general fields in which comparable benefits had previously been granted to veterans of World War II by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, received extensive consideration prior to its enactment. Some of the provisions included were novel and were designed to avoid certain difficulties which had become manifest under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Other provisions were adopted which were substantially identical with the comparable provisions of the earlier act and confirmatory of the same underlying principles. * * *

"The temporary character of this type of benefit is obviously a recognition of the fact that readjustment to civilian life should be accomplished by the veterans within a reasonably short time following service, and that the time element is an essential ingredient of the readjustment principle.

"Sections 212 and 213 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, however, are more than a reaffirmation of the temporary nature of the readjustment benefit. They designedly adopted the supplementary concept of the 1944 enactment that the foregoing readjustment principle needs to be implemented by a statutory requirement that the veteran must make his educational plans, complete all necessary arrangements, and actually commence the pursuit of his program within a fixed period of time. All of this is implicit in the term 'initiate,' as interpreted by the Veterans' Administration in connection with the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and of which the Congress was fully apprised when it selected such term for incorporation in the delimiting date requirements of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

"To be consistent with this concept, and with the basic readjustment purpose, the delimiting period for initiating a program cannot be so short as to leave the veteran insufficient time for the deliberation needed for a wise choice of his objective and to make the necessary arrangements for enrolling in the selected educational institution or training establishment. On the other hand, if the prescribed period is unduly lengthened, the readjustment purpose will tend to become obscured, and procrastination encouraged, most probably to the veteran's own detriment.

"The instant bill does not appear to be designed to change the aforementioned principle, but would allow a more extensive period than that allowed by existing law during which the veteran could commence his program. It therefore poses the question of whether the 2-year delimiting initiation period of existing law is reasonable and adequate or whether a 4-year period (somewhat comparable to the requirement applicable to the World War II education and training program) should be allowed. * * *

"As noted in the second paragraph of this report, H. R. 9888 contains in section 3 an important difference from the language of H. R. 9395 and H. R. 7210 in that it gears the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded to eligible disabled veterans of the Korean service period to their dates of discharge or release from service, with appropriate language to allow all such persons at least 9 years from the date of the enactment of amendatory legislation in which to pursue training.

"The situation relating to disabled veterans of the Korean service period who are in need of vocational rehabilitation training is not completely comparable to that of the World War II veterans. As has been noted, Public Law 894 permits such training to be afforded to qualified veterans until the date 9 years after close of the period which commenced June 27, 1950. Since it is impossible to predict at this time when the extended program will be terminated, the situation is developing in which the Korean veterans will have staggered amounts of time in which to pursue and complete vocational rehabilitation training depending upon their date of discharge. The post-Korean veteran population has already exceeded 2,500,000 persons and this number will continue to be augmented by the large numbers now entering service for the first time. It is obvious that, unlike the World War II situation where the mass demobilization which followed that war afforded all veterans relatively the same amount of time during which they were authorized to pursue training, the present conditions potentially permit some veterans to have many more years during which training may be afforded than others.

"In reporting to your committee on the mentioned H. R. 9395 and H. R. 7210, the Administrator recommended an amendment to Public Law 894, 81st Congress, as amended, along the lines proposed by this bill. Such an action has a precedent in the delimiting requirements for initiating and completing a program of education or training under title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (secs. 212 and 213); which are likewise geared to the veteran's date of discharge or release from active service, with an overall terminal date for the program based upon the termination of the basic service period.

"As an overall matter, it is my view that the present bill involves serious questions of policy, which in the last analysis must be resolved by the Congress.

"No reliable estimate can be made of the cost which would be attributable to the enactment of this bill. Undoubtedly there would be additional cost for direct benefits in an extension of either the Public Law 550 education and training program or the Public Law 16 vocational rehabilitation training program; since persons who would not otherwise take advantage of these benefit programs could be expected to do so during the extended period. Moreover, there would be some ultimate additional expense in administrative costs resulting from the longer period in which both programs would be operative.

"The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget in connection with reports on earlier 83d Congress bills to extend the time limitations of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and on the vocational rehabilitation training program that the Bureau recommended against the enactment of such legislative measures."

Reported in House, July 19; House Report No. 2279.

Passed House, July 21, 1954. (Pending before Senate Labor and Public Welfare.)

Passed the House; Senate reported $50 million instead of $25 million; is on Senate Calendar; awaits Senate vote:

CONTINUE DIRECT LOANS FOR 1 YEAR, H. R. 8152

Title: To extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes. Mr. AYRES. Introduced and referred March 2, 1954.

Analysis: Extends the authority to make direct Veterans' Administration home loans to June 30, 1954, and authorizes $25 million each quarter for such purpose. This authorization to be decreased by whatever amount the Veterans' Administration receives from the sale of previously made mortgages. Loans limited, by regulation, to nonmetropolitan areas.

Digest of Report (Veterans' Administration):

"Since the last renewal of the program by the Congress (Public Law 101, 83d Cong., approved July 1, 1953) there has been some general improvement in the availability of GI loan funds on an overall basis but such improvement seems to have been confined predominantly to urban areas and it, therefore, has been possible to remove only a relatively few areas from the eligible direct-loan list as the result of an increased availability of private financing for GI loans. A further improvement in the supply of private funds for GI loans in 1954 appears likely, but the possibility is remote that such funds will become available to any considerable extent in the rural areas where private capital has never been generally available for financing loans to veterans. This, together with the fact that the magnitude of the waiting list

of veterans applying for direct loans in eligible areas has increased during the past year, suggests that there is a continuing need for direct loans.

"As the committee is aware, eligility for direct home loans has been confined almost exclusively to the smaller towns and more rural counties. Presently there are no cities in eligible areas within the continental United States which exceeded 50,000 in population according to the 1950 census, although a few such cities were eligible for a limited period prior to April 1952. Only a relatively small proportion of the cities with a 1950 population of 25,000 to 50,000 are eligible.

"Thus the operation of the direct-loan program is now restricted almost entirely to the nonmetropolitan parts of the country where veterans have had but little opportunity to obtain the advantages of a GI loan from private lenders in their communities. It should be emphasized that under the Veterans' Administration direct-loan procedures there is an additional safeguard against encroachment upon private economic activities by reason of the requirement that the veteran show expressly that he had been unable to obtain a VA-guaranteed loan from a private lender in his community, before an application for a direct loan is considered by the Veterans' Administration. * * *

"With respect to the funds to be authorized for the future operations of the direct-loan program the attention of the committee is directed to the fact that the existing allocation of $25 million per quarter has not been sufficient to satisfy fully all the requests for direct loans which have been received since the quarter-annual system was established by Public Law 325, 82d Congress, although this sum has contributed measurably toward meeting the needs of veterans in rural and semirural areas.

"An analysis of the monthly trend in the number of veterans waiting to obtain direct loans indicates that the size of the waiting list remained relatively stable during the first half of 1953. From a total of 27,600 on June 30, 1953, the waiting list increased to a peak of 33,400 on September 30, 1953, during a period when the supply of private funds for GI home loans was probably rather limited in most parts of the country. The fact that the waiting list has declined moderately in the last 3 months of 1953 to about 32,000 may indicate that there has been some improvement in areas designated as eligible for direct loans even though the general improvement in loan availability since July 1, 1953, appears to have been confined primarily to urban areas.

"It may be further noted that an increase in the quarterly allocation of direct-loan funds might also stimulate an increase in the requests for designation of additional areas as eligible for VA direct loans. As heretofore stated, the present policy of the Veterans' Administration, pursuant to law and guided by the intent of the Congress as expressed in committee reports which provided additional funds for direct loans, is to confine direct-loan eligibility primarily to the small towns and rural areas of the country. If further increase in the funds for direct loans is authorized, without a further expression of congressional intent in this regard, there will undoubtedly be many requests for designating additional areas as eligible for direct loans.

"For the purpose of making the projections of fund availability and the number of direct loans which might be made under H. R. 7378 and H. R. 7392, it has been assumed that the increased amount of quarterly authorization would become available immediately upon enactment of the legislation. If it is the intent of the committee that the increased quarterly allotment be available only during the 4 quarters of fiscal year 1955, it is suggested that clarification of this point would be advisable.

"In considering proposals to increase substantially the amounts to be authorized in connection with an extension of the direct-loan program, the committee will, of course, wish to take into consideration the increased financing burden which would be imposed on the Treasury by these measures at a time when the need for reducing such burdens is paramount.

"In summary it would appear that private lending sources are not yet able to supply funds for loans to veterans in most rural or semirural areas at an interest rate comparable to that for VA-guaranteed loans and, therefore, the committee may wish to give favorable consideration to a continuation of the direct-loan program beyond June 30, 1954. On the other hand, it is believed that a threefold or fourfold increase in funds, as is provided by H. R. 7378 and 7392, is more than necessary to meet the demand which can be anticipated unless it is proposed to alter the present concept of the program as a supplemental and standby aid only. It would seem that for reasons of administrative simplicity any extension of the direct-loan program should be for a period of not less than 1 year."

Reported March 3, 1954; House Report No. 1267.

Passed; reported in Senate out of Committee on Finance; it now awaits Senate action:

BENEFITS FOR WAAC SERVICE H. R. 8041

Title: To provide benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration based upon service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps under certain conditions. Mr. RADWAN. Introduced and referred February 23, 1954.

Analysis: Grants VA benefits to women who served in the WAAC and who were honorably discharged therefrom for disability rendering them physically unfit for service in the WAAC or in the WAC.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"The bill contains provisions against the accrual of monetary benefits for any period prior to its enactment; precludes payment of compensation or pension concurrently with United States employees' compensation based on such service; and requires an election of benefits where the person is eligible for compensation or pension by reason of this measure and is also eligible for compensation benefits under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

"It is assumed that the reference to the Women's Army Corps is intended to mean the Women's Army Corps established as a part of the Army of the United States by Public Law 110, 78th Congress, approved July 1, 1943, as distinguished from the Women's Army Corps created as a part of the Regular Army by the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (Public Law 625, 80th Cong.). If the bill is further considered, it may be desirable to include specific reference to the Women's Army Corps established by Public Law 110, 78th Congress. It is noted also that the bill covers persons honorably discharged for disability, without restriction to discharge for disability incurred in line of duty. * * *

"It has been the general policy of the Congress to restrict benefits provided under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to persons who actually served in the military or naval service of the United States, a distinction having usually been drawn as between members of the Armed Forces and persons engaged in civilian activities for the Government serving with or in aid of the Armed Forces. Examples of civilian groups performing related service were the merchant marine, the American National Red Cross, the Civil Air Patrol, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, the American Field Service, civilian pilots of the Air Transport Command, the Army Transport Service, the Army Specialist Corps, and other organizations of a similar nature. Departure from the established policy by granting benefits based upon civilian service of a group which served with the Armed Forces might constitute a precedent for extending similar privileges to other civilian groups which also served with or in aid of our Armed Forces, and thus increased demand upon the Congress for corresponding legislation in their favor. * * *

"Others who may have incurred lesser disabilities as members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps would not be included. Moreover, the bill would not include those who served throughout the period without incurring disability and were honorably discharged. In each instance the kind and quality of service may have been substantially the same, and the question arises whether there is a sound basis for distinguishing one group from the other if legislation of this character is to be considered. The 90-day requirement, as well as the requirement that the discharge must have occurred prior to the establishment of the Women's Army Corps, also appear to be limitations which might seem to create preferences among those engaged in essentially the same kind of service with the Army of the United States.

"Among the benefits which might become available in individual cases under the bill are disability and death compensation and pension, vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended, loan assistance under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, assistance in obtaining an automobile under Public Law 187, 82d Congress, and assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under Public Law 702, 80th Congress, as amended. Because of the delimiting dates under titles II and V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, it would appear that those covered by the bill would not be able to avail themselves of education and training or readjustment allowance benefits under that act.

"Because of the lack of information indicating the number of persons who would meet the precise service requirements of the bill and the number among those eligible who would avail themselves of particuair types of benefits, it is not feasible to attempt an estimate of the cost of this measure, if enacted. While it seems probable that the annual cost would not be relatively large, it is at the same time clear that a number of cases would be affected by the bill. * * *"

Reported May 12, 1954; House Report 1594.

Passed the House and is now in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

FEDERAL AID TO STATE HOMES, H. R. 8180

Title: To increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the United States. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request). Introduced and referred March 2, 1954.

Analysis: Increases from $500 to $700 per year the Federal aid to States for the support of veterans domiciled or hospitalized in State homes who are eligible for such care in Veterans' Administration hospitals or domiciliaries. At the present time the payment of the $500 rate is restricted to June 30, 1956. This bill, in addition to raising the rate from $500 to $700, would remove this restrictive date of June 30, 1956, thus establishing $700 as a permanent rate for Federal aid.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"There are 31 State homes located in 27 different States to which the Veterans' Administration is currently making contributions for maintenance of veterans who have been determined to be eligible for care in a Veterans' Administration hospital or home.

The basic law limits the amount that any State may be paid to a sum not exceeding one-half the cost of maintenance of each veteran, and under this limitation 14 of the State homes concerned would not be able to receive the full $700 contribution since the cost of maintenance in these homes, based on fiscal year 1953 reported costs, is less than $1,400 per person. All the other State homes reported maintenance costs in excess of $1,400 per person for fiscal year 1953.

"During the fiscal year 1953, payments of Federal aid were made to the States for a daily average of approximately 8,090 members present in State homes. Based on the reported per capita cost, the total cost for maintaining this daily average present was $13,365,961. The total amount of Federal aid paid by the Veterans' Administration for this number of members was $4,068,170, or 30 percent of the total cost. Based on the average number present during the fiscal year 1953, payments at the rate of $700 per annum would result in a total cost to the Veterans' Administration of approximately $5,225,630—an increase of $1,157,460, or 28 percent. This would result in the Veterans' Administration assuming 39 percent of the total cost of maintaining eligible veterans in State homes and the States paying 61 percent of the cost.

"Since fiscal year 1945, the average member load has shown a sustained upward swing, influenced in part by replacement programs at State homes undertaken to improve and enlarge existing bed capacities, general economic conditions which impose greater financial burdens on those in the lower income groups, and advancing age of World War I beneficiaries who have developed disabling infirmities. In the Veterans' Administration estimates for appropriations for fiscal year 1955 the average patient load in State homes was established at 8,700 members. This projection was based upon current bed-occupancy ratios and anticipated increases in the member load. Therefore, should the rate of Federal aid be increased to $700, the cost to the Veterans' Administration might well be substantially higher than the estimated cost based on the 1953 experience. Should all homes be eligible for payments at the $700 rate, the cost to the Veterans' Administration would be approximately $6,090,000 for fiscal year 1955. As stated above, however, based on the 1953 experience, 14 of the homes would not be able to receive aid at the full $700 rate because their annual reported per capita costs were less than $1,400. It is not known how many of the homes, because of increasing per capita costs, would be eligible for the full amount of assistance at the $700 rate in fiscal year 1955.

"For the fiscal year 1948 (the year in which the rate was raised to $500 per annum) the per diem cost of providing domiciliary care for a veteran in a Veterans' Administration center was $2.64; for the fiscal year 1953 the cost was $3.61—an increase of approximately 37 percent. It appears that the increase proposed by the subject bill compares with the increased cost experienced by the Veterans' Administration."

Reported March 24, 1954; House Report 1415.

The following is a list of States that have soldiers' homes:

State	Average present, 1953	Per capita cost, 1953	Total cost	Paid by VA $500	Paid by State	Percent of cost by VA	Percent of cost by State	Paid by VA $700	Paid by State	Percent of cost by VA	Percent of cost by State
California	1,630.52	$1,571.44	$2,562,264.35	$815,260.00	$1,747,004.35	32	68	$1,141,364.35	$1,420,900.00	45	55
Colorado	36.19	1,479.15	53,530.44	18,095.00	35,435.44	34	66	25,333.00	28,197.44	47	53
Connecticut	540.92	1,830.13	989,953.92	270,460.00	719,493.92	27	73	378,644.00	611,309.92	38	62
Idaho	88.70	681.25	60,426.88	30,213.88	30,213.00	50	50	30,213.44	30,213.44	50	50
Illinois	934.92	1,253.76	1,172,165.30	467,460.00	704,705.30	40	60	586,082.65	586,082.65	50	50
Indiana	336.83	1,251.15	421,424.85	168,415.00	253,009.85	40	60	210,712.42	210,712.43	49	51
Iowa	264.15	1,288.63	340,391.61	132,075.00	208,316.61	39	61	170,195.80	170,195.81	49	51
Kansas	17.82	2,351.29	41,899.99	8,910.00	32,989.99	21	79	12,474.00	29,425.99	29	71
Massachusetts (Chelsea)	645.66	3,808.64	2,459,086.50	322,830.00	2,136,256.50	13	87	451,962.00	2,007,124.50	18	82
Massachusetts (Holyoke)	116.32	6,051.35	703,893.03	58,160.00	645,733.03	8	92	81,424.00	622,469.03	12	88
Michigan	776.82	976.23	758,354.99	379,181.38	379,173.61	50	50	379,177.49	379,177.50	49	51
Minnesota	356.00	1,238.94	441,062.64	178,000.00	263,062.64	40	60	220,531.32	220,531.32	50	50
Missouri	99.19	1,008.81	100,063.86	49,595.00	50,468.86	50	50	50,031.93	50,031.93	50	50
Montana	51.87	1,407.11	72,986.80	25,935.00	47,051.80	36	64	36,309.00	36,677.80	49	51
Nebraska	165.53	1,256.87	208,049.69	82,765.00	125,284.69	40	60	104,024.84	104,024.85	49	51
New Hampshire	35.26	2,123.80	74,885.19	17,630.00	57,255.19	24	76	24,682.00	50,203.19	33	67
New Jersey (Menlo Park)	72.78	1,845.29	134,300.21	36,390.00	97,910.21	27	73	50,946.00	83,354.21	38	62
New Jersey (Vineland)	85.43	2,117.78	180,921.95	42,715.00	138,206.95	24	76	59,801.00	121,120.95	33	67
New York	10.11	1,877.30	18,979.50	5,055.00	13,924.50	27	73	7,077.00	11,902.50	37	63
North Dakota	42.13	1,662.28	70,530.54	21,215.00	49,315.54	30	70	35,265.27	35,265.27	50	50
Ohio	537.53	1,157.46	622,169.47	268,765.00	353,404.47	43	57	311,084.73	311,084.74	49	51
Oklahoma (Ardmore)	110.03	1,114.25	122,600.93	55,015.00	67,585.93	45	55	61,300.46	61,300.47	49	51
Oklahoma (Sulphur)	138.80	1,159.93	160,998.28	69,400.00	91,598.28	43	57	80,499.14	80,499.14	50	50
Pennsylvania	197.60	1,032.61	204,043.74	98,800.00	105,243.74	48	52	102,021.87	102,021.87	50	50
Rhode Island	127.18	1,502.61	191,101.94	63,590.00	127,511.94	33	67	89,026.00	102,075.94	46	54
South Dakota	108.99	1,262.34	137,582.44	54,495.00	83,087.44	40	60	68,791.22	68,791.22	50	50
Vermont	53.32	1,489.11	79,399.35	26,660.00	52,739.35	34	66	39,699.67	39,699.68	49	51
Washington (Orting)	145.48	1,636.82	238,124.57	72,740.00	165,384.57	31	69	101,836.00	136,288.57	42	58
Washington (Retsil)	179.55	1,349.17	242,243.47	89,775.00	152,468.47	37	63	121,121.73	121,121.74	49	51
Wisconsin	259.22	1,830.24	474,434.81	129,610.00	344,824.81	27	73	181,454.00	292,980.81	38	62
Wyoming	17.92	1,567.52	28,089.96	8,960.00	19,129.96	32	68	12,544.00	15,545.96	44	56
Total	8,090.64		13,365,961.20	4,068,170.26	9,297,790.94	30	70	5,225,630.33	8,140,330.87	39	61

This awaits a rule in the House Committee on Rules:

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES, H. R. 8330

Title: To extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance and to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Introduced and referred March 10, 1954.

Analysis: Provides automobiles for World War I veterans on a par with World War II and Korea where they have lost or lost the use of one or both hands, or who are blind. It also extends by 2 years the time applicable for application for this benefit and makes the authority to apply to veterans who have decided to remain in the service.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

The 3-year period for filing application which was provided by Public Law 187 had the effect of granting, as to previously discharged veterans of World War II who could qualify on the basis of loss or loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle, as required by the prior laws, a period of 3 years in addition to such periods after discharge as had been available under the earlier laws. This covered a relatively small number, since the great majority of the World War II group qualifying on the basis of leg disability had already applied for and received this assistance and could not receive it a second time under the new law. As to all others, including World War II veterans claiming on the basis of disability of an upper extremity, the liberalized definition of loss or loss of use of a lower extremity, or impairment of vision, as well as veterans of the Korean conflict period claiming on the basis of any of the three classes of disabilities, the 3-year period prescribed by Public Law 187 represented the total time made available for this purpose.

"Since this program of rehabilitative assistance had been geared to providing aid to severely disabled veterans in adapting themselves to their special problems in civilian life early after discharge from the service period in which the disability was incurred, it was apparently the determination of the Congress in enacting Public Law 187 that 3 years provided a liberal period within which the veteran could and should avail himself of this assistance. It would appear that in any typical case this would afford ample time. There will arise a few unusual situations in which the service-incurred disability will not have progressed to the point of amputation or loss of use or the required impairment of vision within 3 years from the date of enactment of Public Law 187 or 3 years from the date of separation from service, as the case may be. This type of situation can also occur even though the period is extended as proposed. The question of policy as to whether the existing time limit should be extended for any period is, of course, one for determination by the Congress in the light of the basic purposes of this program.

"The proposed section 6 would represent a sharp departure from the underlying objective of the existing and prior legislative enactments in this field. One reason for the several extensions of the original 1-year program for the World War II group was to keep it open until a few who had remained in military hospitals could be discharged and thus acquire eligibility as veterans. The subject proposal would enable the group affected, however limited in number, to obtain for themselves a type of gratuity which was established to meet the rehabilitative and readjustment needs of those who have left the service. Some of the small number involved might be members of the Regular Establishment, following military service as a career, and might not be retired or separated until after the lapse of several years. All beneficiaries under this section would be ac-

corded the proposed payment of $1,600 on the purchase price of a conveyance in addition to the full military pay and allowances which they receive while in the active service.

"These same persons are not in a position of being deprived under the present law of their ultimate right to receive this benefit. Like those who may have been separated shortly after the occurrence of the required disability, persons who are retained on active duty notwithstanding the disability still have 3 years after their discharge or separation date within which to apply as veterans under the law as it now stands.

"It may be added that enactment of this amendment could be invoked as a precedent for extending some other types of benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration in behalf of veterans to persons who have remained continuously in the service, including members of the Regular Establishment. This proposal could therefore be costly as a precedent, as well as being directly inconsistent with the traditional policy of the Congress.

"The Veterans' Administration is not possessed of data from which to determine the additional number of persons who could and would avail themselves of the right to apply for this benefit during the proposed extended period, or the number who might be covered by the proposed inclusion of certain persons in the active service. Accordingly, no estimate of the cost of the proposal, if enacted, can be presented. * * *"

* * * * *

"* * * It is estimated that approximately 5,900 veterans of World War I might be entitled to receive benefits under this proposal during the first year following its enactment by reason of receiving compensation benefits from the Veterans' Administration for the specified disabilities. The benefit cost for this estimated group, at $1,600 per vehicle, would approximate $9,440,000. This estimate is somewhat incomplete in that it does not include such additional eligible World War I veterans who are not drawing benefits from the Veterans' Administration because they are on the retirement rolls of the service departments. Further, the requirements concerning the impairment of vision are such that a comprehensive estimate on that disability class cannot be made without an extensive study of individual records but it is believed that the foregoing estimate includes most of those who would qualify by reason of visual disability. * * *"

Reported May 12, 1954; House Report 1600.

Awaits action by the Rules Committee of the House:

Three-Year Presumption for Arthritis, Psychoses, and Multiple Sclerosis, H. R. 8789

Title: To amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that arthritis, psychoses, or multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected. Mr. Radwan. Introduced and referred April 12, 1954.

Analysis: Grants a 3-year rebuttable presumption of service connection for veterans who developed arthritis (now 1 year), psychosis (now 1 year for compensation and pension and 1 additional year for priority admission to hospitals), and multiple sclerosis (now 2 years).

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"Insofar as H. R. 8789 relates to the disease of psychosis, it is similar to H. R. 320, 82d Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives, May 1, 1951. As you are aware, H. R. 320 was amended in the Senate by the Committee on Finance to provide a conclusive presumption of service connection for an active psychosis developing within 2 years from the date of separation from active service in World War II, but only for the purposes of hospital and medical treatment, including outpatient treatment, authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The bill was passed by the Congress in this form and approved as Public Law 239, 82d Congress, October 30, 1951. Under this law, it is not necessary that the veteran have 90 days' service for the presumption to attach and willful misconduct is not a bar.

"There is definite medical substantiation that the time of onset of a psychiatric disorder, whether a psychosis or a psychoneurosis, is not the only criterion of the cause or causes. Determination of causation, or etiology, of a psychosis in an individual is to be gained by an overall psychiatric evaluation of that particular person. Psychosis may result from any one of a number of factors, such as an inherent or hereditary defect. H. R. 8789, however, would establish a statutory presumption, which grants a presumption of fact, of uniform application, that manifestation of a psychosis at any time up to 3 years after separation is necessarily related to the facts or circumstances of wartime military service, or service on or after June 27, 1950.

"With respect to active pulmonary tuberculosis, the presumptive period was increased from 1 to 3 years by Public Law 573, 81st Congress, June 23, 1950, and for all other types of active tuberculosis it was similarly extended by Public Law 241, 83d Congress, August 8, 1953. The presumptive period provided for the disease of multiple sclerosis was increased from 1 to 2 years by Public Law 194, 82d Congress, October 12, 1951.

"H. R. 3205, 82d Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives, June 20, 1951, proposed to establish a 3-year presumptive period for the disease of multiple sclerosis. This was amended in the Senate by the Committee on Finance, reducing such presumptive period to 2 years. The House of Representatives accepted the amendment and the bill was enacted as Public Law 174, 82d Congress.

"Because of the onset and course of the various types of the disease of arthritis, it is believed that an extension of the 1-year presumptive period would result in the granting of service connection in many cases that may well have their origin in some other intercurrent injury or disease, but which fact is not capable of being established by the required evidence.

"The present regulatory presumptive period does not preclude the granting of direct service connection for arthritis or psychoses when diagnosed more than 1 year after separation from service or for multiple sclerosis more than 2 years thereafter when the evidence of record is deemed adequate to warrant a finding of service connection.

"The 1-year presumptive period for the service connection of a chronic disease, previously covered by regulation based upon sound medical judgment, was in 1933 incorporated in Veterans Regulations promulgated under Public No. 2, 73d Congress. In 1948 Congress specified certain diseases which, among others, should be deemed chronic, but did not extend the uniform 1-year presumptive period (Public Law 748, 80th Cong.). It was not until 1950 that an exception to the general rule was made in the case of active pulmonary tuberculosis (Public Law 573, 81st Cong.), and in 1951 a further presumption was authorized in the case of multiple sclerosis (Public Law 174, 82d Cong.). As previously indicated, in 1951 the Congress also extended the presumptive period for an active psychosis for the limited purposes of hospital and medical treatment, and in 1953 extended the presumptive period for all other types of active tuberculosis to 3 years. The committee will, no doubt, wish to give careful consideration to the problem of whether the proposed extensions of the presumptive periods for certain diseases will be urged as a precedent for extending the presumptive period for many other chronic diseases.

"In addition to granting service connection for disability and death compensation purposes in a substantial number of cases, the bill, if enacted, would confer the same priority right in such cases to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration which is now afforded by law to veterans having directly service-connected conditions. Under existing law, the Veterans' Administration is required to furnish hospital care to eligible veterans needing such care for service-connected conditions, and this may be provided in hospitals under the direct control of the Veterans' Administration, through bed allocations in other Government hospitals, or in appropriate cases by contract with State, municipal, or private institutions. By contrast, veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities may be furnished hospital care by the Veterans' Administration only if beds are available in Veterans' Administration or other Federal Government hospitals. Further, admission of non-service-connected cases is generally conditioned on the inability of the applicant to defray the cost of hospitalization as established by an affidavit procedure. The bill would also have the effect of providing outpatient treatment for the group affected because of the service-connected status which would be granted to them under the bill. Existing law and regulations generally limit outpatient treatment to those requiring such treatment for service-connected disabilities.

"It is not possible to furnish an estimate of the cost of the bill, if enacted, in view of the many unknown and variable factors. However, it is apparent that the cost would be very substantial. * * *"

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Reported May 12, 1954 (H. Rept. 1596).

This is on the Consent Calendar of the House.

Increased Pension for Holders of Medal of Honor, H. R. 8900

Title: To increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor. Mr. Radwan. Introduced and referred April 27, 1954.

Analysis: Today a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor who reaches the age of 65 years is entitled to a special pension of $10 a month in addition to any other compensation or pension to which he may be entitled. This bill increases the rate to $100. At the present time there are 395 living holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Digest of report—Veterans' Administration:

"H. R. 8900, if enacted, would increase from $10 to $100 monthly the rate of such special pension for any person whose name has been entered on the Army and Navy Medal of Honor roll. The increase would be effective from the first day of the second calendar month after enactment of the bill.

"According to Senate Report No. 240 on H. R. 4701, 64th Congress, which bill became the act of April 27, 1916, the provision for an award of $10 monthly to holders of a Medal of Honor who had attained the age of 65 years, 'recognizes and rewards in a modest way startling deeds of individual daring and audacious heroism in the face of mortal danger when war is on, deeds that give soul to an army and character to a country.' The policy of the measure as stated in the Senate report is 'to signalize appreciation of that gallant, intrepid, indomitable spirit in war that becomes the best bond to long-continued future peace.' In debates on the

floor of the House on H. R. 4701, an amendment to increase the rate to $18 monthly was rejected after a statement was made that any increased amount would appear to be a matter of paying pension instead of a matter of honor (53 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. III, p. 2349). In this connection it is significant that H. R. 8900 would increase tenfold the special pension incident to the award of the Medal of Honor.

"As previously noted, the sole responsibility of the Veterans' Administration in connection with the special pension currently authorized is to arrange for its payment to persons certified as entitled thereto by the military departments. H. R. 8900 would not alter this function."

Department of Defense:

"The Department of the Army considers the special pension now authorized for holders of the Medal of Honor as being an additional recognition and not as a means of ascribing a monetary value to an act of heroism, and for that reason feels that the special pension must be of such modest amount that there can be no other interpretation.

"The Department of the Army on behalf of the Department of Defense, therefore, recommends that H. R. 8900 not be enacted.

"It would be impossible to determine the total cost of this bill if enacted, although it is known that at present there are approximately 395 holders of the Medal of Honor still living.

"This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Reported May 12, 1954; House Report 1598.

On Consent Calendar; awaits House action:

STATUTORY AWARD FOR LOSS OF BUTTOCKS, H. R. 7851

Title: To amend the veterans' regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks. Mr. Hébert. Introduced and referred February 12, 1954.

Analysis: Provides for a statutory award of $47 per month in addition to other compensation for those service-connected veterans who have suffered the loss of both buttocks.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"The basic rates of compensation for service-connected disability under the act of March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations issued pursuant thereto, are based generally on the theory that the amount of compensation payable should be proportionate to the degree of disability resulting from injury or disease. In making exceptions to this principle the Congress for many years restricted its special consideration in the form of additional allowances to cases of loss or loss of use of one or more of the extremities, blindness, and for helplessness or a bedridden condition requiring aid and attendance. The loss or loss of use of a creative organ was placed in this category in 1924 for World War I veterans and included in the law applicable to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict by Public Law 427, 82d Congress, June 30, 1952.

"The authorizing of special rates of compensation in excess of those prescribed according to the degree of disability involves a policy which is primarily for determination by the Congress. But it must be recognized that in the absence of a medical or other sound basis for such special awards they create inequities and are difficult to justify. Singling out the loss or loss of use of both buttocks for a special allowance, as proposed by the bill, would be discriminatory and no doubt lead to requests for special consideration and additional allowances in cases of numerous serious disabilities in other categories, many of which may have equal, if not greater, merit.

"It is believed that the basic principle that the amount of compensation payable should be proportionate to the degree of disability is sound, and that legislative proposals to make additional exceptions, if favorably acted upon, may contribute to adverse criticism and possible impairment of the compensation program.

"Statistics are not available to show the number of veterans who might qualify for the additional compensation as provided in the bill since it is not possible to identify those on the rolls whose disability meets the condition specified. Therefore no estimate of cost is submitted, but it is believed the cost would be negligible."

Reported May 12, 1954; House Report 1592.

This is on Consent Calendar of the House:

STATUTORY RATE FOR CERTAIN LOSSES, H. R. 7712

Title: To amend the veterans regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Introduced and referred February 3, 1954.

Analysis: Provides a statutory rate of compensation of $266 a month for veterans who have lost an eye in combination with the loss of a limb. The rate today varies depending on the severity of the disability, and this bill would put this class of veterans on a parity with those who have lost both legs or both hands or are blind.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"The World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, provided a rate of $100 monthly for total permanent disability and an additional sum of $50 monthly if the disabled person was so helpless as to be in need of a nurse or attendant. The act provided a statutory total permanent disability rating for the loss or loss of use of 1 hand or 1 foot with blindness of 1 eye. However, these conditions of themselves have generally not been considered as requiring regular aid and attendance and have not been paid the additional allowance for a nurse or attendant. The $50 allowance was, however, generally paid to persons having lost, or lost the use of both hands, or both feet, or of both eyes, or of 1 foot and 1 hand. Under Public Law 2, 73d Congress, and Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, the rates for permanent total disability and for disability causing need for regular aid and attendance were combined into 1 rate of $150 (now $266), and this rate was made applicable to the 4 combinations presently included in subparagraph (1), supra, namely, the anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of 1 hand and 1 foot, or blindness in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less. This rate was not provided for the loss or loss of use of 1 hand and 1 eye or 1 foot and 1 eye because, as indicated, such losses generally do not require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

"The bill, if enacted, would provide the same rate of compensation for veterans who generally do not require regular aid and attendence as is now provided for those who do require regular aid and attendance.

"The basic rates of compensation for service-connected disability under the act of March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations issued pursuant thereto, are based generally on the theory that the amount of compensation payable should be proportionate to the degree of disability resulting from injury or disease. The authorizing of special rates of compensation in excess of those prescribed according to the degree of disability involves a policy which is primarily for determination by the Congress. But it must be recognized that in the absence of a medical or other sound basis for such special awards they create inequities and are difficult to justify.

"The Veterans' Administration does not have available data on which to base an estimate of the cost of the bill, if enacted.

"It is believed that the basic principle that the amount of compensation payable should be proportionate to the extent of disability is sound and that legislative proposals to make additional exceptions, if favorably acted upon, may contribute to adverse criticism and possible impairment of the compensation program. Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration is unable to recommend favorable consideration of H. R. 7712 by your committee."

Reported May 12, 1954; House Report 1591.

GUATEMALA

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I talked with Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, the head of the new anti-Communist government in Guatemala, with the members of the junta and with other top leaders who helped to drive the Communists out from their principal beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. I was the first Member of the United States Congress to visit Guatemala in a long, long time. The welcome they gave me is indicative of their sincere interest in and friendship for the United States. The new leaders of Guatemala are determined not only to purge their country of communism but also to follow a democratic and realistic program for the improvement of the lot of the Guatemalan workingmen and farm workers. They are sincere friends of the United States and deserve our help in carrying out their program.

The importance of what has happened in Guatemala can scarcely be overestimated. It is the first time since the war that any country has totally thrown off the yoke of communism, and apart from Yugoslavia, Guatemala is the only country which once within the grasp of the Soviets has slipped away. This should be an encouragement to all peoples who resist communism.

In Guatemala, the utter depravity of the Communist system was fully revealed. Before Castillo Armas revolted against the Communist-front government of President Arbenz, we had all seen how the Communists had come to run the government there from behind the scenes, how they had gained control of the labor movement and used the workers for political purposes, and how they had spread the poison of anti-American propaganda to break down the spirit of cooperation which should exist between us and our Latin American neighbors. However, it was not until Arbenz was overthrown that the full rottenness was exposed. While I was in Guatemala, they were still looking for mass graves where anti-Communists, most of them simple workers and farmers, had been dumped after they had been tortured, mutilated, and finally killed. In their flight, Arbenz and his followers robbed the treasury of more than $1 million in cash, but did not pay for several weeks the wages of the gov-

ernment road workers whose back pay by coincidence amounted to almost exactly the same sum.

Now the leaders of Castillo Armas' government have the enormous job of reconstructing the country. They all told me that they did not wish to turn the clock back to the old-fashioned dictatorships that Guatemala had until 10 years ago. They want to consolidate and extend the social gains of the workingmen and farm laborers which the previous Communist-front government promised but did not deliver. They have promised the labor unions freedom to operate normally, on the sole condition that they keep Communists out, and representatives of our A. F. of L. and CIO have already gone down to Guatemala to help the unions there with their problems of reorganization. They have guaranteed that the land justly distributed under the old agrarian-reform law will not be taken away, and that they will pass a new law giving the farmers this land as their private property instead of merely making them tenants of an all-powerful state as the previous Communist-front government did. Most of all they are interested in developing the country's economy in order that the people there can have a better life and be immune to the Communist virus.

In this program, Guatemala needs help. Castillo Armas' government has already pledged that foreign capital investment will be welcomed and protected so long as it conforms to the law and gives Guatemalan workers just treatment. But beyond private investment there are other steps to be taken. The technical assistance program should be stepped up immediately. It provides a means of showing the Guatemalan people, particularly in the rural areas, that the democratic side delivers results where the Communists gave them only empty promises. We should also resume as quickly as possible our contribution to the completion of the Inter-American Highway in Guatemala, where an unfinished 25-mile section is all that is lacking for a passable through highway from the United States to Guatemala and beyond. The opening of this highway would be of strategic value to us and of great benefit to the economy of Guatemala, and the leaders there have put it at the head of their list of public works projects. Another project meriting our help is the Roosevelt Hospital, which is to be the largest in Central America and a symbol of the cooperation between the United States and the people in that area. The former Communist-front government in Guatemala did not back this project, but the new government is anxious to do its share to complete it in cooperation with us.

These are some of the things we should do to show Guatemala's new government and the people behind it who courageously stood up to communism, that we are ready to cooperate with them in solving the problems which confront them. Communism has been rolled back from its principal bridgehead in this hemisphere and now the job is to clean up the wreckage it left behind.

No report on Guatemala would be complete without credit for the great work done there by United States Ambassador John E. Peurifoy. By his work and bearing, he represents the best type of American diplomacy. He upholds the dignity and prestige of the United States, but he is sympathetic to the deserving problems of the nation to which he is accredited. When Ambassador Peurifoy first went to Guatemala, the American flag no longer flew above the American Embassy. The Communists were riding high and by threats and intimidation, they had frightened the Americans into almost complete inactivity. Peurifoy not only ordered the American flag immediately to be flown above the embassy, but he also flew it on his automobile where everyone would know that Americans are proud of their flag and their Nation and have no fear of gangster methods. When threats of revolution filled the air in that fear-ridden country, Ambassador Puerifoy showed no concern for his personal safety and when the revolution actually broke out the foes of communism naturally turned to him for advice. He took part freely in the negotiations which lead to a successful conclusion for democracy. A man of smaller stature would have hidden behind protocol and we very probably would have seen another triumph for communism. Ambassador Peurifoy, by his courageous and forthright stand, enjoys the confidence of the government and the acclaim of the populace.

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

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

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the distinguished gentleman from Florida. It was my privilege to be associated with him at the sixth Pan-American Road Conference and I want to say publicly that he did an excellent job down there and I am sure all will learn of his excellent work at a future date.

Mr. SIKES. My friend is very kind and I certainly want to return the compliment because he was one of the real leaders in the very important work done in the sixth Pan-American Road Conference.

THE LATE GRANTLAND RICE

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of this month one of America's greatest sportswriters left his many friends for the new world that exists beyond. Fortunately, he left behind in this world not only great personal memories but also a wealth of articles, columns and poems.

One of the basic philosophical contentions contained in the writings of Shakespeare, and particularly in his sonnets, was the powerful thought that no matter whether man came or went, that no matter what he constructed of a material nature—time would destroy all. Yet, a poet's verse, the story of a wise author, or the melody of an excellent composer live on forever. And so Grantland Rice will join the happy few who belong to posterity.

It appears to be the vogue, today, to create antagonisms. Newspaper writers say that they have a story only if they can pit one man against another. Granny Rice never followed this theme. And who can deny that he was the sports dean of our generation? Granny Rice pointed out the good that was in a man. Granny Rice emphasized the achievements and accomplishments of the particular sports hero. He minimized the petty, the small, or the foul conflicts upon which minor men breed.

This humble man was born in Murfreesboro, Tenn., in November of 1880. He attended Nashville Military Academy, graduating from Vanderbilt University in 1901. He married his dear Kate in 1906. Their only child, Florence, is a successful actress. Mr. Rice worked successively with the Nashville News, Forester Magazine, Atlanta Journal, Cleveland News, Nashville Tennessean, and the old New York Mail. For 15 years he worked for the New York Tribune, and, since 1930, he has had a syndicated column entitled The Sportlight. Granny Rice served his country in 1918 and 1919 as a 1st lieutenant in the 30th Division in France.

From the midtwenties until the war it was my privilege to be Grantland Rice's next-door neighbor in East Hampton, Long Island. As a small boy I used to cross the rail fence that separated our property and visit with this fine man and his charming, friendly, sweet wife. The porch door was always open. He was always ready for a discussion of the important events of the day. Remember, now, that the important events of the day to a teenage boy in the midthirties was, "How is Joe Louis going to do in his first big fight?", or "Is Babe Ruth really through?" or "Why did Helen Wills walk off the court when being given a trouncing by Helen Jacobs?" And, Granny Rice always had the right answer, putting sportsmanship in its proper light. For example, Mr. Rice's most famous lines now give mute tribute to the underlying philosophy of the man. His life matched these lines:

> When the Great Scorer comes
> To mark against your name,
> He'll write not "won" or "lost,"
> But how you played the game.

Bob Cooke in his article in the New York Herald Tribune on July 15 presented several examples of Grantland Rice's most human side:

> The ordinary baseball writer, entering a dugout, has to remind the ballplayers what his name is. He reintroduces himself more often than a minor league politician. In the case of Grantland Rice, the routine was reversed. Yankess, whom Rice didn't know, introduced themselves to him. Ballplayers don't come by this habit every day.
>
> An enduring quality of Granny Rice was his enthusiasm. He never lost interest in any sport and he'd enjoy the tale of the golfing duffer who'd just broken 95, as much as a conversation piece by Bill Dickey about the Yankee teams of yore.
>
> Though Granny had more rank as a writer of sports than any of his colleagues, he had a way with young reporters which was warm,

friendly, and sincere. He was very good to them, and would listen to their problems more like a father confessor than an associate.

And one special incident from Mr. Cooke's article, never before reported, belongs as part of this brief history:

It occurred at Hialeah, several years ago, when three people were lunching in the clubhouse prior to the first race. Included in the group was Richards Vidmer, former New York Herald Tribune sports columnist and lifelong friend of Mr. Rice.

Between courses, a member of the luncheon party excused himself and headed for the daily double windows. On his return, he looked at Vidmer and said, "Say, I've just met the greatest guy you ever saw."

"Who's that?" Vidmer idly inquired.

"Grantland Rice."

To which Vidmer promptly replied: "That's the most unoriginal remark I ever heard."

I believe the inspiration for what could be entitled "Journey's End" might have come to him one wind-swept, fall day as he stood watching the ocean spray on the tall dune in front of his house in East Hampton. I can imagine him turning back from the gray sea and the long black land as the sun had set. I can imagine him smiling a little and walking into his library, sitting down and writing—

I'm going home some day—
So moves the dream of all the roving world,
The seekers of far lands who've lost their way,
God's countless aliens by the current whirled
From out the harbor and by tempest tossed,
To unknown lands where they must ever roam,
And this is all that makes life worth the cost,
This endless dream—some day I'm going home.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO FUTURE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 568 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to procedure for the consideration of future amendments. Of course any thought of urging its consideration at this session of Congress is farthest from my mind. It is introduced at this time in order that the Members may have the opportunity during the next 5 months to read and study it and if Dame Fortune and the good voters of the district I represent favor me, come November next, I shall reintroduce it early in the 1st session of the 84th Congress and urge its consideration and submission to the various States for ratification. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has likewise today introduced House Joint Resolution 569, which is identical to House Joint Resolution 568.

Article 10 of the Bill of Rights reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Our Founding Fathers might well have added, "except the power to propose amendments to the Constitution."

The resolution I have introduced preserves the existing methods of amendments to the Constitution and adds a third one. Method No. 1 is the one which has hitherto been used. It provides that a resolution proposing an amendment must originate in the Congress, must pass both Houses by a two-thirds majority of each, after which to become effective it must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. Method No. 2 must originate with the States wherein the legislatures of two-thirds of the States make application to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments. If the convention proposed any amendments, they would be submitted to the States and, again, to become effective must be ratified by three-fourths thereof. This method has never been used. It was probably intended to be resorted to in case occasion should ever require a general overhauling of the Constitution on a large scale. It requires action by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States to make application and by the Congress to call the convention, set up when and where it should meet, the number of delegates of whom it should be composed, the method by which the delegates should be chosen, probably temporary rules for the organization of the convention, and probably compensation for the delegates to the convention and the general expenses in connection therewith. In this case also the proposals, if any, as the result of the deliberations of the convention to be effective must be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

The third method which I propose in the current resolution requires no action from the Congress whatever. It provides for no conventions. It originates with the States, stays within control of the States, and when ratified by three-fourths of them becomes a part of the basic law of the land.

In short, it provides that the legislature of any State may propose an amendment to the United States Constitution by passing the proposal by a two-thirds majority of each house of the State legislature and then transmitting a certified copy of the proposal to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretaries of state of each of the several States. When certified copies of the resolutions of any 12 of the legislatures of the several States by a two-thirds vote of each house thereof shall be concurred therein, it shall be deemed to have been submitted to the States for ratification and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the States in the same manner as all constitutional amendments.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment provides that the act of proposal, concurrence in the proposal or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable. This extends the same rule of law as now applies to ratification of an amendment to the proposal and concurrence of 11 other States to the proposal.

Section 3 of the proposed amendment provides that a proposal shall be inoperative unless it shall have been concurred in by 12 States within 7 years from the date of the proposal and unless it shall be ratified by three-fourths of the several States within 15 years from the date of its submission or for such shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

Section 4 of the proposed amendment provides that controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and may be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States.

If this resolution I have introduced carries and eventually becomes a part of the Constitution, then that basic law may in the future be amended upon ratification of three-fourths of the various States upon, first, a proposal submitted by two-thirds of each House of Congress, as it exists at present; or, second, a proposal submitted by two-thirds of the States for a constitutional convention which must be called by the Congress and legislation for the time and place of the convention, the number of delegates, the manner of their selection, their compensation, if any, and the general expenses of the conventions, as exists at present; or, third, a proposal eminating from the States when two-thirds of each house of the legislature shall pass identical resolutions for submission of the proposed amendment.

In other words, in the future, if the amendment I propose should be adopted and ratified, proposals to amend the Constitution would come, first, wholly on the part of Congress; or, second, on the part of the States and the Congress; or, third, on the part of the States.

I trust this proposed amendment will, in the 84th Congress, receive the serious thought and consideration of its Members.

For the convenience of the Members, I attach hereto as a portion of my remarks, the text of House Joint Resolution 568:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congressess assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of article V of the Constitution of the United States, the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SEC. 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution pro-

posing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each House shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; provided, that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of Puerto Rican independence.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include a table.

Mr. YORTY in eight instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instancs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include additional matter.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. HUNTER and to include additional matter.

Mr. SAYLOR.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for this day on account of official business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5173. An act to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over employment security administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a $200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1770. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 243 (a) (3) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 relating to allowances for uniforms and equipment"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 8, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of project for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries with respect to Old River control, prepared in accordance with section 6 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1772. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood-control projects by local interests"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1773. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 22, 1954, the following bill was reported on July 24, 1954:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10051. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 26, 1954*]

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. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2744. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2746. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3532. An act to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9582. A bill to provide for the transfer of excess property to the Territorial Government of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2496. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 648. Resolution to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria; without amendment (Rept. No. 2497). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9988. A bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany; without amendment (Rept. No. 2498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5183. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MERROW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 8684. A bill to provide for a reciprocal and more effective remedy for certain claims arising out of the acts of military personnel and to authorize the pro rata sharing of the cost of such claims with foreign nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 686. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10051, a bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2528). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 687. Resolution for consideration of S. 2033, an act relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; without amendment (Rept. No. 2529). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee of conference. H. R. 8300. A bill to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States (Rept. No. 2543). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6451. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Robert Ward Morgan and others of certain real property in Box Elder County, Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 2495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 659. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 9334) for the relief of Walter W. Flora and Mildred L. Flora, doing business as Flora Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Marko Ribic; without amendment (Rept. No. 2500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6149. A bill for the relief of Ekea Jahns; with amendment (Rept. No. 2501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Roger Feghali; without amendment (Rept. No. 2502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8694. A bill for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux; without amendment (Rept. No. 2504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8812. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; with amendment (Rept. No. 2505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9029. A bill for the relief of Paul James Patrie; without amendment (Rept. No. 2506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9440. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Elizabeth Davis (nee Eisenreider); without amendment (Rept. 2507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft; without amendment (Rept. No. 2508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 65. An act for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1212. An act for the relief of Alice Masaryk; without amendment (Rept. No. 2510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1600. An act for the relief of Esther Saporta; without amendment (Rept. No. 2511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2176. An act for the relief of Maly Braunstein and Aurelia Rappaport; without amendment (Rept. No. 2512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2257. An act for the relief of Luigi Cicchinelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 2513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2295. An act for the relief of Irma Mueller Koehler Cobban; without amendment (Rept. No. 2514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2340. An act for the relief of Alphonsus Devlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2448. An act for the relief of Frantisek Vyborny; without amendment (Rept. No. 2516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2469. An act for the relief of Francisco Vasquez-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez); without amendment (Rept. No. 2517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2493. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Bodgner Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2504. An act for the relief of Elisa Albertina Cioccio Rigazzi or Elisa Cioccio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3514. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oveida Mohrke and her son, Gerard Mohrke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9814. A bill for the relief of Alfio Capizzi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 684. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 10017) for the relief of William T. Dorminy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6531. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; with amendment (Rept. No. 2526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 384. An act for the relief of Robert H. Webster; without amendment (Rept. No. 2527.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1216. An act for the relief of Karl L. von Schlieder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1434. An act for the relief of William B. Baker and Don P. Fankhauser; without amendment (Rept. No. 2531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1615. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George P. Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 2532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clair F. Bowman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1795. An act for the relief of Fred and Bernice Ehlers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1925. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Carl E. Welchner, United States Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2147. An act for the relief of Terrence Waller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carl Dobratz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2266. An act for the relief of Walter P. Sylvester; without amendment (Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. Eugene Lamb; without amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2553. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2693. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2823. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Hedmark, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 22, 1954, the following bill was introduced on July 24, 1954:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 10051. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred July 26, 1954*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10052. A bill to authorize Federal payments to enable the States to expand their school construction programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 10053. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to liberalize the retirement benefits of female officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10054. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of December 19, 1913, so as to permit the sale of water rights thereunder to public utilities which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10055. A bill to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10056. A bill to provide a limitation on the application of section 691, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and of section 126, Internal Revenue Code of 1939, to prevent confiscatory double taxation of livestock, growing and harvested crops in the estates of deceased farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10057. A bill to amend section 812 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the deduction of inheritance, succession, or other death taxes imposed by law other than Federal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 10058. A bill to provide emergency relief in the drought-stricken areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 10059. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10060. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restictions to such State and town by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 10061. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., lands surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration Hospital Reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 10062. A bill to amend section 172 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 10063. A bill to authorize the payment of damages to the landowners of certain drainage districts in Missouri, arising from the construction and operation of navigation pools in the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10064. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration center for domiciliary and chronic care at the Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 568. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to senate joint resolution No. 4, rescinding a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritance, and gifts, adopted February 25, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 10065. A bill for the relief of Mario Fernandes Mano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 10066. A bill for the relief of Alice Jane Brookins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10067. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10068. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 10069. A bill for the relief of Rosy Vong Juin Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10070. A bill for the relief of Maria Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10071. A bill for the relief of Adeline Nixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10072. A bill for the relief of Elena Gigliotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1121. Mr. HOSMER presented a petition of members of Burns Memorial Evangelical United Brethren Church of Long Beach, Calif., for legislation preventing the interstate transportation of alcoholic beverages and prohibiting the advertisement thereof on television and radio, and for similar purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Strengthening the United Nations Organization and the Threat of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Chinese representation in the United Nations organization has a direct and vital bearing upon the broader question of strengthening the United Nations through revision of the charter. The framers of the United Nations Charter wisely made provision under article 109 for the convening of a special conference for review of the charter if the member nations so desired. From present evidence that conference will probably be held within the next year or two. In anticipation of the revision conference the Senate, in July of last year, passed a resolution providing that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations make a full and complete study of proposals to amend, revise, or otherwise modify international security organizations. In September of last year the Secretary of State called for a broad public discussion on revision of the United Nations Charter, preliminary to the forthcoming conference. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee is preparing staff studies on many of the problems related to charter revision Hearings are being conducted in major cities throughout the United States.

We are informed that the American people—community organizations, service clubs, university groups, church bodies, professional groups, and private citizens in all walks of life—are inundating the subcommittee with correspondence and testimony. This evidence of a widespread interest in the United Nations is accompanied by realistic popular awareness that the charter is not an infallible instrument. It is recognized that the perfection of machinery for the settlement of international disputes and the maintenance of peace is an evolutionary process. The far-reaching search for means of strengthening the United Nations reflects not only evidence of inherent weakness in the present charter but a potential for strength which comes with experience and maturity.

It appears evident that such aspects of charter revision as relate to the composition and powers of the Security Council, the veto, and membership cannot be divorced from the question of representation of Communist China. More significantly, the issue of Communist Chinese representation brings into question the very purposes and principles on which the United Nations has been founded.

I call attention to charter revision since it is of profound concern to every American citizen, affecting as it does, the establishment of institutions which may preserve the peace long after the Chinese Communist regime is forgotten. Yet, the danger looms that in its present stage of development, the United Nations may be destroyed from within. While endeavoring to perfect the machinery of the United Nations, the organization is threatened, perhaps not so much by its structural frailties as by a possible compromise of the principles which provide the basis of its moral strength.

Notwithstanding mechanical failings, the United Nations will survive so long as a predominant will exists for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and for the enforcement of collective action against those nations that violate the peace. However, the insinuations of a defiant, reckless, ambitious, and aggressive power into its midst, as a result of the abandonment of principle, would spell disintegration and perhaps even disaster for the United Nations.

If the strength of the United Nations depends upon the will for peace among its members and if the charter prescribes a willingness to carry out the obligations of the charter as a condition of admission of new members, by what reasoning can less strict criteria be applied to the admission of a new government to represent a state already a member? In the light of the standards of admission the exclusion of the Mao Tse-tung regime is predetermined by the very conduct of that regime. That conduct