Under these conditions it is no more than right that the proceeds from these Federal resources in the upper basin States should be used to offset the interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government to build the irrigation features of reclamation projects.

23. A discussion of the southern California proposals for alternate land reclamation in nonarid areas:

Wet lands of South, East, and Midwest can be drained and cleared. It is estimated that perhaps as much as 21 million acres might be reclaimed by such action.

The soils for the most part are shallow and infertile from centuries of leaching by heavy rains. Heavy applications of fertilizers will be required annually. These annual costs plus the first cost of reclamation greatly exceed the cost of reclamation by irrigation.

Except for limited areas, the cropping pattern will be limited to a few crops, most of which are in surplus.

If these lands had been attractive for reclamation at the very low costs as claimed by the southern California groups opposing upper Colorado River development, why haven't they been reclaimed before, during the period of agricultural shortages and high prices for agricultural products?

Within 15 years this country will need to have every available acre of productive agricultural land in production including the total irrigable area in the 17 Western States.

Every year the highway, airfield and urban expansion is taking out of production more available land than is being brought into production. It is reported by the Soil Conservation Service that these withdrawals amount to more than 1 million acres per year. In the four upper Colorado River Basin States, 160,000 acres of cropland are diverted to other uses every year.

24. Current power production at Hoover Dam:

The contracts for power were based on a rate sufficient to repay the entire cost of the dam and power facilities in 50 years. Power which was considered to be firm and available at all times, regardless of development in the upper basin, is under contract at the rate of 1.34 mills per kilowatt-hour. Power, which is to be available only so long as upper basin is not using its water, is secondary or dump power, and the rate for this power is .33 mills per kilowatt-hour.

So long as the upper basin is kept from using its water, the secondary power at Hoover is just as good as firm power, and the southern California users get it for the secondary rate and sell it as though it were firm power. The value of this power, being made with water apportioned to the upper basin States, amounts to approximately $4 million per year. This is an outright gift to the southern California power users at the expense of the upper basin States.

From 5 to 10 million acre-feet of water per year is now going into the sea from the Colorado River. This water is being used to generate power for the primary benefit of California.

With the completion of construction of Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams, this water which is now wasting into the sea will be used to fill those reservoirs, and later for consumptive uses in the upper basin.

The loss of this power source is one of the main reasons for California's opposition to the Colorado River storage project, in spite of the fact that California signed the Colorado River compact and agreed to a division of the waters of the Colorado River. Planned reductions of firm power to the lower basin as a result of expected upper basin water diversions are plainly provided for in Hoover Dam power contracts.

25. The real issue—who gets the water and the power.

There is not sufficient water in the Colorado River to supply all the agricultural, industrial and domestic needs of the area.

After all the water of the Colorado River is consumptively used, there will still be thousands of acres of thirsty lands, raw materials undeveloped and living space unoccupied by people because of lack of water.

To provide for an equitable division of this water resource among the States of the basin, a compact, dividing the use of the water among them, was drawn, signed by each State and the United States.

This compact divided the use of the water between the upper and lower basin, the first 15 million acre-feet equally.

The lower basin (California, Arizona, and Nevada) developed first with the support of the other States and the use of money from the Federal Treasury.

Storage reservoirs, powerplants, control structures and conveyance channels have now been built, largely under the reclamation law, sufficient to control, divert and convey all the water of the river.

There are more than 2 million dry acres in the Colorado River Basin of Mexico and 500,000 acres in the Imperial Valley of California waiting for water to make them productive. It would take more water to irrigate these lands than the entire allotment to the upper basin.

An insatiable power market exists in the southern California area sufficient to use all the power that can be generated with all the water in the Colorado River system.

The lower river is completely regulated by the Hoover Dam.

Water runs downhill. If by any means the upper basin States can be kept from using their water, this water will run downhill and southern California and Mexico will get it.

This water resource is literally worth billions of dollars. It is not surprising, therefore, that the southern California opposition is willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the people in the upper basin from utilizing their allocated water.

There is only one issue to this controversy—who gets the water and the power allocated by compact to the upper basin States?

Failure to authorize this project by this Congress will lend the support of this body to the consummation of the "steal of the century," whereby one Commonwealth, which has become prosperous and powerful as a result of water and power made available through Federal aid from a common river source which was divided by compact, now uses that strength and economic wealth to take, by indirection, that portion of the river resource apportioned to the upper basin by a valid contract which that Commonwealth signed.

26. Partnership in reclamation:

The reclamation partnership program joins good land and good water with good people. This combination creates new fertile acres, new wealth which will produce food and fiber in perpetuity. In one sense, a nation is only as strong and enduring as its food supply. In another and more important sense, no nation can be strong unless there exists a deep spirituality among its citizens.

Fulfilling the commandment God gave in the beginning, "to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it," is one of the best ways to develop those spiritual forces every nation must have to endure. The good earth is man's best friend. In Proverbs it is declared, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." The subduing of the earth requires imagination—vision. Let us have that same vision that inspired the Dutch, who reclaim land from the ocean itself, to live their creed that "A nation that lives builds for the future."

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

Rev. Andrew K. Rule, professor of church history and apologetics, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in Thy mysterious providence, hast laid upon us responsibilities of unimaginable proportions, far surpassing in their demands the limits of human knowledge and wisdom, grant us the guidance of Thy spirit, who knows the end from the beginning; and make us sensitively responsive to His gentle leading; that what we shall do together this day may be acceptable in Thy sight and beneficial to all mankind.

With sorrow, but in faith, we bow before Thy inscrutable will, thanking Thee for the rich blessings that came to us and to our country through the life and service of our friend, Senator KILGORE; praying that the consolations of Thy gospel may be richly ministered to his bereaved family; and that Thou wilt raise up others to fill this great gap in the ranks of those who serve. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 27, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 25, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8675) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEATH OF SENATOR KILGORE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, it is my melancholy duty to inform the Senate that earlier today our distinguished, beloved colleague, HARLEY M. KILGORE, passed into the silent land from which no traveler ever returns.

Later the Senate will be asked to designate a day on which to commemorate this great patriot, statesman, and friend.

I present a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 221), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of said committee, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

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, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after consulting with the minority leader, I should like to announce that an appropriate day will be set aside when tributes may be paid to our late beloved colleague, HARLEY KILGORE.

At the present time, Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. It was with a deep sense of shock that I heard this morning of the passing of Senator KILGORE. The attending physician at the Capitol told me yesterday that HARLEY KILGORE was in serious condition. But it was a little difficult for me to realize just how serious the situation was.

HARLEY KILGORE was a kindly man. HARLEY KILGORE was a gentle man. He was beloved by his friends, and his friends were many.

He dedicated his abilities to the service of the people of his State, and they reciprocated by honoring him and by electing him to serve in this body.

We all mourn his passing. Our hearts are with his loved ones, and our prayers are dedicated to bringing them solace and comfort in this trying hour.

The working people of this country, Mr. President, have lost one of the best friends they ever had, and we have lost one of our most loyal colleagues.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, I wish to join in the expressions of the majority leader, and to concur in stating that, after a conference with the members of the family of our late colleague, at a later time a day will be set aside when eulogies may be delivered by his colleagues on the life and public services of the late Senator KILGORE.

All of us on this side of the aisle heard with profound regret of the passing of our late colleague, and we on this side of the aisle, along with his colleagues on the other side, join in extending our deepest sympathy to the family of our late colleague, and to the people of his State, whom he served for so many years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee provided for in the resolution will be appointed later.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation on statements of not to exceed 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, on December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the following publications: A-48, Rules of Practice and Procedure, June 1, 1955; A-49, Regulations Under the Federal Power Act, September 1, 1955; R-51, Typical Residential Electric Bills, January 1, 1955; P-29, Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States by Regions, 1954-80; S-116, Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1954; S-117, Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1954; S-118, Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants, 1954; S-119, Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1954; M-45, Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines, December 31, 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Ouintah Starr, of Lansing, Mich., relating to the bill (S. 1636) to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Pioneer Water Co., Tulare County, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction of the Success Dam on Tule River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Tarrant County, Tex., Medical Society, commending Senator DANIEL for his stand against further economic aid to foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Edward Reinhart, of San Diego, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Rockaway Council, No. 2672, Knights of Columbus, Rockaway Beach, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amend-

ment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the administrative committee of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, at Madison, Wis., favoring an investigation of all activities of the gas and oil lobby; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3299. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lewis de Huszovszky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3300. A bill for the relief of Ivan Curko, also known as Ivan Sam Curko or John Curko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3301. A bill for the relief of Josefa Kusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request):

S. 3302. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3303. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Colorado; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3304. A bill for the relief of Satenik Damlama;

S. 3305. A bill for the relief of Livio Cianci; and

S. 3306. A bill for the relief of Sergius Kusmin and his wife, Irene Kusmin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3307. A bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KERR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3308. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income-tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. Res. 221. Resolution pertaining to the death of the late Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. NEELY, which appears in his remarks under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the majority whip, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana, [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to safeguard the interests of our citizens in honest elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be kept on the desk until Monday next, in order that any Senator who may care to associate himself as a sponsor may have that opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure has been carefully drawn, in consultation with some very able lawyers from the drafting service, lawyers with the policy committee, and with Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. It is bipartisan in the fullest sense of the word, and I believe no election bill can be successful unless it has the sympathetic understanding of Members of both parties.

The basic assumption of the bill is that the people are entitled to all the relevant facts before they select their public officials. The sponsors of the measure have tried to insure that those facts will be presented.

Our bill would require a complete accounting by Federal candidates of their campaign contributions and their spending.

Our bill would set realistic spending limits—limits that will not invite evasion of the law.

Our bill would require the big campaign contributors to make an accurate—and a complete—report of their contributions.

Our bill would permit the granting of free and equal time to Presidential candidates of the major parties.

Our bill would encourage the small campaign contributor by granting him a tax deduction up to $100 for his political contributions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a concise explanation of the bill.

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

ELECTION BILL

A. TITLE I—CORRUPT PRACTICES

1. Redefines candidate to include candidates for President and Vice President.

2. Redefines political committee to include all committees receiving contributions or making expenditures in excess of $100 in connection with Federal general elections. Existing law covers only interstate committees.

3. Prohibits committees from receiving contributions or making expenditures on behalf of a candidate unless specifically authorized in writing to do so. Permits withdrawal of such authorization by candidates. Makes candidates liable for violations by authorized political committees.

4. Reduces the number of reports to be filed by political committees and changes the method of reporting to insure a fuller disclosure of all material information.

5. Requires all expenditures by persons other than political committees in excess of $100 to be publicly reported in the same manner as political committees report. Also will require consolidated reports from individual contributors of more than $5,000.

6. Requires candidates to report twice on each election, all to the Clerk of the House and district courts of their residence, and Senators and presidential candidates to the Secretary of the Senate in the same manner as political committees are required to report.

7. Requires candidates for nomination or election to the House and Senate to file with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate certified true copies of campaign statements required to be filed by State law in their States.

8. Specifies obligations of the appropriate committees of the Senate and House and of the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate to improve reporting systems under the law, compile and disseminate the information in the reports, insure and improve enforcement of the law, and make recommendations for improvements.

9. Changes of the existing limitations on campaign expenditures in the following manner:

Senators (and representatives-at-large):

Existing law (applies only to candidates)—$10,000, or 3 cents per vote cast in the last general election, but not to exceed $25,000.

Proposed (applies in aggregate to candidates and all committees)—$75,000, or 20 cents per vote cast in any State election held in preceding 4 years, whichever is higher.

Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioner:

Existing law—$2,500, or 3 cents per vote cast in the last general election, but not to exceed $5,000.

Proposed—$15,000, or 20 cents per vote cast in any election for such office in preceding 4 years, whichever is higher.

Specifically provides that candidates may not spend more than their State law permits, regardless of these provisions.

10. Amends the existing provisions of law with respect to the limitations on individual contributions only to the extent necessary to make them consistent with the other changes in the bill.

11. Repeals the existing $3 million limitation on expenditures by national political committees and establishes for all political committees a new ceiling of 20 cents per vote cast in any of the last three Presidential elections. This would amount to over $12 million for the present. While this seems high

for State and local committees, it must be remembered that existing law established no limits for them.

B. TITLE II—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

1. Permits individuals to deduct in any taxable year not to exceed $100 for political contributions. This would allow $200 deductions on joint returns.

C. TITLE III—POLITICAL BROADCASTS

1. Amends section 315 of the Communications Act to allow radio and TV licensees to grant free equal time to any Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate whose party's candidate in the preceding Presidential election received not less than 4 percent of the total popular votes cast or who is supported through his political party by petitions signed by no less than the number of valid signatures which aggregate not less than 1 percent of the total popular vote cast in the last Presidential election.

2. Provides that the Federal Communications Commission shall establish appropriate rules and regulations for implementing this statute and shall, upon the request of a licensee, declare the eligibility of any candidate for the Presidency or Vice Presidency for equal free radio and TV time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe, Mr. President, that every Member of the Senate will agree with me that the present election laws are obsolete. They were passed at a time when the population of the country was considerably smaller, and the expenses of campaigning were relatively modest.

The result of such laws in a jet age can only be confusion. Our people are entitled to procedures which give them accurate and complete accounting—accounting that is understandable to all.

The sponsors of this measure do not pretend that it is the answer to all the intricate problems of modern-day campaigning. We do not have enough information to present all the answers or even to try to present all the answers.

We are hopeful that we can have an honest election bill to cover the election in 1956, and we indeed look forward to the complete recommendations in the report which will be submitted by the blue ribbon special committee named by the Vice President. Perhaps it will be possible to enact a much more comprehensive and extensive bill when their final report is available.

All of us must admit that, as we go along, it is probable that further legislation will be necessary. For example, I doubt whether any of us really know how much a campaign costs, and I do not believe we can even find out in the absence of such legislation as I am proposing today.

We believe that, by and large, this legislation will be a good beginning. We believe it will be a long step forward in the establishment of procedures which will protect the most basic right of the people in a great democracy—the right to know all the facts about their public servants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have just introduced be printed in the body of the RECORD, to accompany my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act of 1956."

TITLE I—CORRUPT PRACTICES

SECTION 101. (a) Section 302 (b) of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;".

(b) Section 302 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $100 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of candidates or Presidential or Vice Presidential electors;".

(c) Section 302 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, subvention, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution;".

(d) Section 302 (e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, subvention, advance, deposit, or gift, of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;".

SEC. 102. Section 303 (c) of such Act (relating to keeping of receipted bills for expenditures by political committees) is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 103. Section 303 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) No contribution shall be accepted and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee (other than a political committee which is a branch, subsidiary, or affiliate of a political party legally existent under the laws of the State within which it is located) until the candidate (or a representative designated by him in writing) has authorized in writing the political committee to support his candidacy and has filed a copy of such authorization with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. In the case of political committees supporting a candidate for President, Vice President, or Senator, such authorization shall also be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(2) Upon the filing by a candidate of a withdrawal of authorization with the Clerk of the House of Representatives (and, in the case of candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, with the Secretary of the Senate), and upon the receipt of notice of withdrawal of authorization by the treasurer of a political committee, the political committee shall be prohibited from receiving further contributions or making further expenditures on behalf of the candidate unless a new authorization is filed."

SEC. 104. Section 305 of such Act (relating to statements to be filed by political committees is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, between the first and fifth days of July in each year, and also on the fifth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee, and also on the fifth day of January, a statement containing, complete as of the fifth day next preceding the date of filing—

"(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution, and the names of the contributors shall be arranged alphabetically within each category, according to the amount of contribution as follows: $100 to $499; $500 to $999; and $1,000 and over;

"(2) the total sum of the contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

"(3) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(4) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more has been made by such committee, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(5) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4); and

"(6) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

"(b) (1) Each item of expenditure shall be described in sufficient detail to accurately identify it, including, in the case of printed cards, pamphlets, circulars, posters, dodgers, booklets, or other such advertisements, writings, or other statements (such as reprints from periodicals, books, newspapers, or other publications), the title and number of each; in the case of newspaper advertisements, the names of the newspapers; and in the case of radio and television time, the names of the stations. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (including State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate shall be in the same ratio as specific expenditures on behalf of each candidate (including State and local candidates) for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures.

"(2) Each expenditure shall also be described by general category, including (i) personal services and reimbursed expenses (salaries, commissions, fees, traveling, and subsistence), (ii) printing and advertising other than radio and television, (iii) radio, (iv) television, (v) office overhead, (vi) subvention or transfer to other political committee or candidate, (vii) miscellaneous, and the total expenditure for each such category shall be listed.

"(c) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

"(d) The statement filed on the 5th day of January shall cover the preceding calendar year.

"(e) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice

President, or Senator, a copy of the statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate."

SEC. 105. Section 306 of such act (relating to statements to be filed by persons other than political committees) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. (a) Every person (other than a political committee) who makes an expenditure in one or more items, aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a candidate or political committee, for the purpose of influencing the election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives an itemized detailed statement of each expenditure in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or Senator shall file a copy of the statement with the Secretary of the Senate.

"(b) Every individual who makes contributions and/or expenditures in one or more items aggregating more than $5,000 within a calendar year for the purpose of influencing the election of candidates in any and all Federal elections, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives a consolidated statement showing all such contributions and/or expenditures, described in sufficient detail to accurately identify them, including the amount of each item, the date when made, and the name and address of the person to whom made."

SEC. 106. Section 307 of such Act (relating to statements to be filed by candidates) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives on the fifth day before, and also within thirty days after, the date on which an election is to be held—

"(1) a correct and itemized detailed statement of contribution received by him and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 305, including, in the case of contributions, amounts expended from his own funds; and

"(2) a statement of every promise or pledge made by him or by any person for him with his consent, prior to the closing of the polls on the day of the election, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy, and the name, address, and occupation of every person to whom any such promise or pledge has been made, together with the description of any such position. If no such promise or pledge has been made, that fact shall be specifically stated.

"(b) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) (1) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward. The statement to be filed on the fifth day preceding an election shall be complete as of the fifth day next preceding the date of filing, and the statement to be filed within thirty days after an election shall be a final and complete statement.

"(c) Every candidate shall enclose with his first statement a report, based upon the records of the proper State official, stating the total number of votes cast at the election required to be used as a basis for the computation under section 309 (b) (2) or (3).

"(d) For the purpose of further informing the Congress and public, every candidate for nomination or election to the Senate or the House of Representatives shall file with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House, respectively, within thirty days following an election a certified true copy of any statement or statements of campaign contributions and expenditures required to be filed by him in his State by the laws thereof, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall determine only that such statements are in fact true copies of the reports filed in the particular States.

"(e) In the case of a candidate for Senator, a copy of the statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate."

SEC. 107. Section 308 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"A copy of every statement required to be filed under the provisions of this title (except statements filed under section 307 (d)) shall also be filed with the clerk of the United States district court in the district in which the principal office of the political committee is located, in the case of statements by political committees; in the district in which the candidate resides, in the case of statements by candidates; and in the district in which contributions are received and expenditures made, in the case of statements by others."

SEC. 108. (a) Subsection (b) of section 309 of such Act (relating to limitations on amount of expenditures by candidates), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as the maximum limit of campaign expenditures, a candidate, in his campaign for reelection, may make expenditures up to—

"(1) the sum of $75,000 if a candidate for Senator or Representative at Large, or the sum of $15,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner; or

"(2) in the case of candidates for Senator or Representative at Large, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of votes cast in any election held in the State in the preceding 4 years; or

"(3) in the case of candidates for Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of votes cast in any election held in the State in the preceding four years for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks."

(b) Section 309 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) For the purposes of the limitation prescribed in subsection (b) there shall be included in the total of expenditures made by a candidate the expenditures made on behalf of the candidate by all committees except those not authorized to support his candidacy. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (including State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate shall be in the same ratio as specific expenditures on behalf of each candidate (including State and local candidates) for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures."

SEC. 109. Section 314 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Any candidate who knowingly consents to any violation of this title by an authorized political committee shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years.

"(d) To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of this act and in developing such amendments or legislation related thereto as it may deem necessary, the appropriate committees of the Senate, in the case of candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, as well as in the case of political committees supporting candidates for election to such offices, and the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives, in the case of candidates for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, as well as in the case of political committees supporting candidates for election to such offices, shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the administration of this act by the agencies concerned. It shall be the duty of these committees—

"(1) to study all pertinent reports filed under the provisions of this act and such other materials as may be necessary;

"(2) to ascertain whether candidates, political committees, or others have failed to file statements as required by this act or have filed defective statements;

"(3) to report violations of this act to the appropriate law-enforcing agencies of the Government and to review such reports at regular intervals to ascertain the action taken by those agencies. Any department, official, or agency administering the provisions of this act shall, at the request of any such committee, consult with the committee, from time to time, with respect to their activities under this act;

"(4) to take such other action as shall be necessary and proper to supervise the administration of this act; and

"(5) to report to the Senate or the House of Representatives respectively, from time to time, on their activities under this Act.

"(e) (1) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate (A) to develop uniform methods and forms for the making of reports required under this title; (B) to provide for making the statements filed under this title available for public inspection; (C) to ascertain, when practicable, whether candidates, political committees, or others have failed to file statements or have filed defective statements and to give notice to delinquents directing them to file such statements or to correct defective statements; (D) to provide for the preparation and periodic publication of compilations containing summaries indicating the total contributions and expenditures and the total for each category of expenditure in each statement filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate, and the name and address of, and the amount contributed by, each contributor shown by any such statement to have contributed the sum of $500 or more.

"(2) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the summaries prepared by him under this section, and the notices of delinquency dispatched by him to delinquent candidates, committees or others, to the appropriate committees of the Senate.

"(3) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit the summaries prepared by him under this section, and the notices of delinquency dispatched by him to delinquent candidates, committees or others, to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 110. So much of section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code as defines the terms "candidate", "political committee", "contribution", and "expenditure" is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;

"The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $100 in any calendar year for the purpose of

influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of candidates or Presidential or Vice Presidential electors;

"The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, subvention, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution;

"The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, subvention, advance, deposit, or gift, of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;".

SEC. 111. The second paragraph of section 608 (a) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "This subsection shall not apply to contributions made by a political committee."

SEC. 112. The first paragraph of section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "No political committee shall receive contributions or make expenditures during any calendar year in amounts greater than the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number of voters casting votes for candidates for the office of Presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office."

TITLE II—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"(a) Allowance of deduction: In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made within the taxable year. A political contribution shall be allowable as a deduction only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Limitation: The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $100 for any taxable year.

"(c) Definition of Political Contribution: For purposes of this section, the term 'political contribution' means a contribution or gift to—

"(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"(2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual."

(b) The table of sections to part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. Cross References."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"SEC. 218. Cross References."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date.

TITLE III—POLITICAL BROADCASTS

SEC. 301. Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 315) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified and nominated candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunity in the use of such broadcasting station to every other such candidate for such office—

"(1) who is the nominee of a political party whose candidate for that office in the preceding presidential election was supported by not fewer than 4 per centum of the total popular votes cast; or

"(2) whose candidacy is supported by petitions filed under the laws of the several States which in the aggregate bear a number of signatures equal to at least 1 per centum of the total popular votes cast in the preceding presidential election and which signatures are valid under the laws of the States in which they are filed.

"(b) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any other public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station.

"(c) No licensee shall have any power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (b). No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

"(d) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes set forth in this section shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"(e) The Commission shall—

"(1) prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section, and

"(2) determine, and upon request of any licensee notify such licensee concerning, the eligibility of each candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States to receive equal opportunity under subsection (a) in the use of any broadcasting station."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, an editorial from the Washington News, and an article written by the very able reporter of the United Press, John A. Goldsmith, which I regard as an accurate summary of my views on this general subject.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 28, 1956]

REPORTING COMES FIRST

The amount of support Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND are mustering in their bipartisan efforts to obtain a practical electoral reform law is very encouraging. One indication of the breadth of the support is the bill introduced yesterday by Representative WILBUR MILLS to grant a $100 income tax deduction on political contributions. This is essentially the same proposal already made by Senator HENNINGS and Representative UDALL, and its enactment should help stimulate small contributions at a time when expenditures are being brought under better control. Since tax measures must originate in the House, additional sponsorship by one of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee materially increases the chance of action.

In light of the progress of the reform bill it is unfortunate that a statement issued by Senator HENNINGS' office has attacked the Johnson-Knowland draft for its failure to include primaries. We agree that it would be desirable to have a new law on campaign expenditures include primaries, which are the meaningful elections in perhaps one-third of the States. There was such a provision in the original Hennings bill, and it is useful to have the principle restated. Soundings on Capitol Hill have indicated, however, that because of controversy over Federal powers a bill covering primaries would face many difficulties.

Senator JOHNSON has indicated that he does not rule out the reporting of expenditures in primaries, and we hope that he and Mr. KNOWLAND will find an acceptable formula. Perhaps the answer lies in the proposal of Senator MUNDT to require candidates to file in Washington duplicate copies of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures. In any event, our own feeling is that it would be better to concentrate on a general bill covering the reporting of contributions and expenditures, even though it might fall short of the ideal, than to permit a fight over primary coverage to snag the whole effort.

The compelling need is to obtain full reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures in general elections, with realistic overall limits and with identification of the original source of funds. That is the approach which the Johnson-Knowland effort appears to take, and it is aimed at correcting the major evil which concerns Mr. HENNINGS—namely, the dependence on and influence of undisclosed funds. The proposed plan also would include the $100 income-tax deduction and a provision enabling television and radio stations to grant free time to major presidential contestants. The important thing, it seems to us, is to get behind this plan which would correct the big defects and has a reasonable chance of passage, and to leave the more controversial qualifications for later action if necessary after the reform becomes law.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1956]

FULLEST OF FULLEST

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says Congress will be pressed at this session to pass a law which will encourage the "fullest public participation and the fullest public review" of all elections.

That is an apt description of the principle on which the proposed law should be written.

How to write an enforceable law which will be realistically effective is another matter.

This is where the new lobby-campaign fund investigation comes in.

There isn't any reason, as Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND suggest, Congress can't pass a new election-money law at this session, even if the investigation is incomplete. There are ample defects in the present law which are obvious to any practical observer.

But before it is ended the Senate probe ought to give the lawmakers an abundance of useful guides on tightening up the law. Certainly, that will be the result if the committee runs a hard-hitting inquiry, as promised.

A foremost purpose of this investigation is to give the public a full review of how campaign funds are raised, how they are accounted for, or not accounted for, and what influences they exert on the candidates who benefit from them.

Public opinion often needs to be backed up by a stiff law, to make itself truly effective. But the public itself can be a decisive influence on public policies, once it has an opportunity to make its views known.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1956]

STRAITJACKET PREDICTED FOR INFLUENCE PEDDLERS

(By John A. Goldsmith)

Senate Democratic leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, predicted yesterday the impending Senate investigation of lobbying will result in a law that will put the influence peddler in a straitjacket.

At the same time, he said, the law will fully protect each citizen's constitutional right of petition.

JOHNSON made his prophecy in a discussion of the lobbying inquiry to be started soon by a select eight-man bipartisan Senate committee created earlier this week. The committee was set up as an outgrowth of an oil lobbyist's $2,500 election campaign contribution which Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, rejected.

JOHNSON said the investigation will not be confined to attempts to influence legislative action. He pointed out that the authorizing resolution also applies to the executive departments of the Government.

"I would think that everybody in the executive departments would want to be ready to fully disclose or explain any improper influences they may have any information on," JOHNSON told newsmen.

Speaking for the Senate's Democratic leadership, he urged anyone anywhere who has such information to come forward with it.

"I predict that we'll come out of this whole thing with an up-to-date lobbying act, a comprehensive law which will protect a citizen's right of petition and, at the same time, put the influence peddler in a straitjacket," he said.

But he cautioned that a modernized lobbying act will become a reality only after hearings by the new committee, and a subsequent study by the Government Operations Committee which is the regular Senate committee with jurisdiction. There is a real problem, he said, in determining where free speech ends and lobbying begins.

JOHNSON said the committee will hold an organization meeting Tuesday. He declined to speculate on who will be the chairman, but it is expected to be Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee.

JOHNSON'S statement came just 24 hours after he disclosed that the Senate leaders in both parties are trying to draft a new elections law in time for this year's elections.

[Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, was expected to introduce in the House this week a bill to permit income-tax deductions for political contributions of up to $100, a plan advocated by Senator JOHNSON. MILLS is a high-ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

[The exemption for political contributions has been urged to encourage wider participation in politics and reduce the importance of large gifts from a few sources.

[Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, meanwhile put forward a plan under which he said an "honest elections" bill might indirectly cover primaries. His proposal would require candidates to file in Washington duplicates of their accounting of contributions and expenses as required by State laws.]

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLAR BOOMERANG

Demands for action on lobbying and campaign spending followed CASE'S disclosure that an oil company attorney, John M. Neff, Nebraska lobbyist for Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, had left a $2,500 contribution for his campaign after seeking out CASE'S views on the natural gas bill.

The special four-man committee, formed to look into the CASE incident, yesterday called Neff's Lexington (Neb.) law partner for testimony. The group sent a subpena to Paul J. Gerdes to testify Tuesday when Chairman WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, Georgia, hopes to wind up the committee's hearings.

[The Associated Press reported that Robert J. Brisson, a Sioux Falls, S. Dak., telephone company official, was subpenaed yesterday to appear before GEORGE'S committee. Brisson, local manager for the Northwestern Bell Co., was ordered to produce all toll tickets, records or other documents pertaining to calls made to Washington from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader or the home of E. J. Kahler, the newspaper's business manager, between January 13 and 28. Kahler recently appeared before the committee and a grand jury investigating the CASE incident. Kahler received the contribution which Senator CASE later rejected.

[It was also reported from Pierre, the State capital, that Geraldine Ostroot, South Dakota's secretary of state, had been instructed to submit to the George committee a certified copy of all campaign contributions made to the Republican State Central Committee since 1940.]

Informed sources said that Gerdes, as Neff's partner, has some records and information which bear on Neff's gift of $2,500 to the Nebraska State GOP Committee. Neff made that gift, and tried unsuccessfully to make another, after learning that Nebraska's two Republican Senators were not interested in $5,000 which he had been authorized by the interests controlling Superior to give them.

GEORGE had previously announced that the Tuesday hearing will feature more testimony by Neff, Elmer Patman, the Superior Oil Co. attorney who hired Neff, and perhaps Howard B. Keck, Superior president whose "personal" funds were the source of the money rejected by CASE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish again to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the honest-election bill which I introduced on behalf of the majority leader, the minority leader, and the majority whip will be at the desk, under the unanimous-consent agreement until next Monday. I am hopeful that every Member on the minority side as well as on the majority side, who desires to be a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, will so inform the clerk.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is proposed to be the "Housing Amendments of 1956," and which is the legislation recommended to the Congress by the administration.

Having served as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and being presently ranking member of that committee and its Housing Subcommittee, I take pride in sponsoring the administration bill at this time.

I desire that the bill, and a brief summary of its provisions, follow my statement in the RECORD, so that they will be available to those Senators who wish to have ready access to them.

There have been several bills introduced in this session purporting to represent the needs of our people for housing legislation. Many of them are so broad in scope that they would ultimately lead to a complete socialization of housing and housing credit.

In contrast, the bill I introduce today takes into account the need for liberalization of some programs heretofore enacted by the Congress, continues others in present form, and generally stabilizes the housing economy, second only to agriculture in its economic impact upon the Nation.

I am confident that enactment of the administration proposals as carried out in the Capehart bill will enable private enterprise to meet substantially the needs of the Nation.

There is provided in this bill the authorization for the low-rent public housing to the amount of 35,000 units per year during fiscal 1957 and 1958. This is the number I supported in the last session of this Congress, and is consistent with the need for adequate housing to place those removed by governmental action from less desirable housing.

As a co-sponsor of proposed legislation already introduced to assist the elderly in their quest for better housing, I am happy to endorse also the provisions of this bill which assist in this endeavor. The facilities of both private and public housing assistance are made available under its terms.

The general authorization of the Federal Housing Administration is continued, and terms and amounts of title I are extended in scope, the college housing and urban renewal programs are provided for, FNMA secondary market operations would be broadened, and disposition of defense and World War II housing would be effected.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency recommends continuation of the so-called Capehart amendment under title VIII, which subject will be covered more fully by the Defense Department in appearances before the committee. I expect to devote considerably more time to the subject of military housing on some other occasion.

We are, Mr. President, in an economy where the well-being of our people is being preserved and strengthened; where the best brains of our Nation are being utilized to bring to Americans a more abundant life in a peaceful existence. The aims of this administration and the Republican Party, of which it is representative, are well-defined in the minds of Americans throughout the land. There shall be peace. There shall be prosperity. They shall exist together, one with the other.

The bill I introduce today conforms with those aims; it is legislation looking to a peaceful future and based upon the needs of our people in a large and important segment of our economy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3302) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1956."

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "and prior to September 30, 1956,".

(b) Section 2 (b) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000" and inserting "exceeds $3,500";

(2) striking out "except that" in clause (2) and inserting "except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to 5 years and 32 days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and"; and

(3) striking out "$10,000" in the first proviso and inserting "$15,000 nor an average amount of $2,500 per family unit."

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

SEC. 102. Title I of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to establish a Fire and Hazard Loss Fund which shall be available to provide such fire and hazard risk coverage as the Commissioner, in his discretion, may determine to be appropriate with respect to real property acquired and held by him under the provisions of this act. For the purpose of operating such fund, the Commissioner is authorized in the name of the fund to transfer moneys and require payment of premiums or charges from any one or more of the several insurance funds established by this act and from the account established pursuant to section 2 (f) of this act, in such amounts and in such manner, including repayments of such moneys, as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall determine. In carrying out the authority created by this section, the Commissioner and the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund shall be exempt from all taxation, assessments, levies or license fees now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Moneys in the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund not needed for current operations of the fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States or in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to purchase such other insurance protection as he may, in his discretion, determine, and he may further provide for reinsurance of any risk assumed by the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund."

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 103. Section 203 (b) (2) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting a comma and the following: "except that with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who is 60 years of age or older, as of the date the mortgage is endorsed for insurance, the mortgagor's payment required by this proviso may be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor under such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 207 (b) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "to take" in the fifth sentence and inserting "(except provisions relating to housing for elderly persons) to take"; and

(2) striking out "hereunder" in the sixth sentence and inserting "hereunder (except with respect to housing designed for elderly persons, with occupancy preference therefor, as herein provided)."

(b) The second sentence of section 207 (c) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "two per family unit," and inserting "two per family unit, or if 25 percent or more of the family units are designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner and if the number of bedrooms is equal to or exceeds two per family unit for such units as are not specially designed for the use of elderly persons,"; and

(2) by inserting a colon and the following provisos before the period at the end thereof: "*Provided*, That if the entire property or project is specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner and the mortgagor is a financially qualified nonprofit organization acceptable to the Commissioner, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property as may be attributable to dwelling use and not in excess of 90 percent of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of such property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons priorities in occupancy of the units designed for their use."

GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 105. (a) Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "July 1, 1955" in the first sentence and inserting "July 1, 1956";

(2) striking out "$4,000,000,000" in the first sentence and inserting "$3,000,000,000"; and

(3) striking out "section 2" in the first and second sentences and inserting "section 2 and section 803."

(b) Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "title" in the first proviso the following: "(except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing amendments of 1955)."

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

SEC. 106. Section 221 (d) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "$7,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$8,000";

(2) striking out "$8,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$10,000";

(3) striking out "95 percent of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 5 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of acquisition in cash or its equivalent" in clause (2) and inserting "the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence, less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses)";

(4) striking out "95 percent of" in clause (3); and

(5) striking out "thirty" in clause (4) and inserting "forty."

APPROVAL OF COST CERTIFICATIONS

SEC. 107. Section 227 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) inserting the following new sentence between the first and second sentences: "Upon the Commissioner's approval of the mortgagor's certification as required hereunder such certification shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor."; and

(2) striking out "legal expenses," in clauses (i) and (ii) in paragraph (c) and inserting "legal expenses, such allocations of general overhead items as are acceptable to the Commissioner,".

MILITARY HOUSING

SEC. 108. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the last proviso and the colon which precedes it.

TITLE II—SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

SEC. 201. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "; and (2)" and inserting ", (2)";

(2) striking out "if (i)" and inserting "if"; and

(3) striking out "or (ii) the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage" and inserting ", and (3) except with respect to mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii, the Association may not purchase any mortgage offered for purchase under section 305 if the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit."

SEC. 202. Subsection (b) of section 303 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting: "The Association shall accumulate funds for its capital surplus account from private sources by requiring each mortgage seller to make payments of nonrefundable capital contributions equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association from such seller or equal to such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent thereof, as the Association may determine from time to time, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy."

SEC. 203. Subsection (a) of section 304 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "at the market price" in the second sentence and inserting "within the range of market prices."

SEC. 204. Subsection (c) of section 305 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended

by substituting "purchases" for "purchasers" in the clause preceding the proviso.

SEC. 205. Section 306 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) striking out "and subsection (e) of this section" in the last sentence of subsection (c); and

(2) repealing subsection (e).

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

GENERAL

SEC. 301. (a) Section 105 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "(including any redevelopment plan constituting a part thereof)."

(b) Section 110 (b) of said act is hereby amended by striking out clause (3) and the semicolon and the word "and" which immediately precede said clause and by inserting the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (1).

SEC. 302. (a) Section 110 (c) of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Urban renewal project' or 'project' may include undertakings and activities of a local public agency in an urban renewal area for the elimination and for the prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight, and may involve slum clearance and redevelopment in an urban renewal area, or rehabilitation or conservation in an urban renewal area, or any combination or part thereof, in accordance with such urban renewal plan. Such undertakings and activities may include:

"(1) Acquisition of (i) a slum area or a deteriorated or deteriorating area, or (ii) land which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or (iii) open land necessary for sound community growth which is to be developed for predominantly residential uses: *Provided*, That the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section that the area to be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area shall not be applicable in the case of an open land project;

"(2) Demolition and removal of buildings and improvements;

"(3) Installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds and other improvements necessary for carrying out in the urban renewal area the urban renewal objectives of this title in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(4) Disposition of any property acquired in the urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(5) Carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; and

"(6) Acquisition of any other real property in the urban renewal area where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density (including measures designed to reduce the vulnerability of metropolitan target zones from enemy attack), eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or otherwise to remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration, or to provide land for needed public facilities.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include the construction or improvement of any building, and the term 'redevelopment' and derivatives thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment. For any of the purposes of section 109 hereof, the term 'project' shall not include any donations or provisions made as local grants-in-aid and eligible as such pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of section 110 (d) hereof.

"Financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character unless such area will be a predominantly residential area under the urban renewal plan therefor: *Provided*, That, where such an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character contains a substantial number of slum, blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating dwellings or other living accommodations, the elimination of which would tend to promote the public health, safety and welfare in the locality involved and such area is not appropriate for predominantly residential uses, the Administrator may extend financial assistance for such a project, but the aggregate of the capital grants made pursuant to this title with respect to such projects shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of capital grants authorized by this title.

"In addition to all other powers hereunder vested, where land within the purview of clause (1) (ii) or (1) (iii) of the first paragraph of this subsection (whether it be predominantly residential or nonresidential in character) is to be redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses, loans and advances under this title may be extended therefor if the governing body of the local public agency determines that such redevelopment for predominantly nonresidential uses is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and local community objectives and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise: *Provided*, That loans and outstanding advances to any local public agency pursuant to the authorization of this sentence shall not exceed 2½ percent of the estimated gross project costs of the projects undertaken under other contracts with such local public agency pursuant to this title."

(b) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of said act is hereby amended by striking out the words "either the second or third sentence" in clause (2) and inserting "the second sentence."

SEC. 303. The first sentence of section 110 (d) of said act is hereby amended by striking out the phrase ", public facilities financed by special assessments against land in the project area," in clause (3) and adding the following proviso before the period at the end of the sentence: ": *And provided further*, That in any case where a public facility furnished as a local grant-in-aid is financed in whole or in part by special assessments against real property in the project area acquired by the local public agency as part of the project, an amount equal to the total special assessments against such real property (or, in the case of a computation pursuant to the proviso immediately preceding, the estimated amount of such total special assessments) shall be deducted from the cost of such facility for the purpose of computing the amount of the local grants-in-aid for the project."

SEC. 304. Section 110 (e) of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Where real property in the project area is acquired and is owned as part of the project by the local public agency and such property is not subject to ad valorem taxes by reason of its ownership by the local public agency and payments in lieu of taxes are not made on account of such property, there may (with respect to any project for which a contract of Federal assistance under this title is in force or is hereafter executed) be included, at the discretion of the Administrator, in gross project cost an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes which would have been levied upon such property if it had been subject to ad valorem taxes, but in all cases prorated for the period during which such property is owned by the local public agency as part of the project, and such amount shall also be considered a cash local grant-in-aid within the purview of section 110 (d) hereof. Such amount, and the amount of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes included in gross project cost, shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator and such rules, regulations, limitations, and conditions as he may prescribe."

DISASTER AREA

SEC. 305. (a) Add the following new heading and section at the end of title I of said act:

"DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 111. Where the local governing body certifies, and the Administrator finds, that an urban area is in need of redevelopment or rehabilitation as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and for other purposes' (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance under this title for an urban renewal project with respect to such area without regard to the following:

"(1) The 'workable program' requirement in section 101 (c), except that any contract for temporary loan or capital grant pursuant to this section shall obligate the local public agency to comply with the 'workable program' requirement in section 101 (c) by a future date determined to be reasonable by the Administrator and specified in such contract;

"(2) The requirements in section 105 (a) (iii) and section 110 (b) (1) that the urban renewal plan conform to a general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program referred to in section 101 (c);

"(3) The 'relocation' requirements in section 105 (c): *Provided*, That the Administrator finds that the local public agency has presented a plan for the encouragement, to the maximum extent feasible, of the provision of dwellings suitable for the needs of families displaced by the catastrophe or by redevelopment or rehabilitation activities;

"(4) The 'public hearing' requirement in section 105 (d);

"(5) The requirements in sections 102 and 110 that the urban renewal area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area; and

"(6) The requirements in section 110 with respect to the predominantly residential character or reuse of urban renewal areas.

"In the preparation of the urban renewal plan with respect to a project aided under this section, the local public agency shall give due regard to the removal or relocation of dwellings from the site of recurring floods or other recurring catastrophes in the project area."

(b) Clause (d) (1) (A) of section 220 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(A) be located in (i) the area of a slum clearance and urban redevelopment project covered by a Federal-aid contract executed, or a prior approval granted, pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954, or (ii) an urban renewal area (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended) in a community respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the certification to the Commissioner provided for by subsection 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or (iii) the area of an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as

amended: *Provided*, That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (i) or (ii) of this sentence, a redevelopment plan or an urban renewal plan (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended), as the case may be, has been approved for such area by the governing body of the locality involved and by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and said Administrator has certified to the Commisisoner that such plan conforms to a general plan for the locality as a whole and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to assure the completion of such redevelopment or urban renewal plan: *And provided further*, That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (iii) of this sentence, an urban renewal plan (as required for projects assisted under said section 111) has been approved for such area by the said governing body and by the said Administrator, and the said Administrator has certified to the Commissioner that such plan conforms to definite local objectives respecting appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to asure the completion of such urban renewal plan, and".

(c) Section 221 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by—

(1) adding immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence the words ", or (3) there is being carried out an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended"; and

(2) striking out "clause (2)" in the places it appears in the last proviso and substituting "clause (2) or (3)."

(d) The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Administrator is further authorized to make planning grants for similar planning work: (1) in metropolitan and regional areas to official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agencies empowered under State or local laws to perform such planning; (2) to cities, other municipalities, and counties having a population of 25,000 or more according to the latest decennial census which have suffered substantial damage as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and for other purposes' (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster; and (3) to State planning agencies for the provision of planning assistance to such cities, other municipalities, and counties referred to in clause (2) hereof."

PLANNING AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 306. The last sentence of said section 701 is hereby amended by striking out "$5 million" and inserting "$10 million."

TITLE IV—PUBLIC HOUSING

LOW-RENT HOUSING

SEC. 401. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as of August 1, 1956, to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1, 1957, and may enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional unit shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That no new contracts for loans and annual contributions for additional dwelling units in excess of the number authorized in this sentence shall be entered into unless authorized by the Congress."

(b) Clause (2) of the third proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration" is hereby repealed.

SEC. 402. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956,"

SEC. 403. Subsection (d) of section 21 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the figure "10" in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15."

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 404. (a) Section 2 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (2) thereof: "The term 'families' means families consisting of two or more persons, a single person 65 years of age or over, or the remaining member of a tenant family. The term 'elderly families' means families the head of which or his spouse is 65 years of age or over."

(b) Section 10 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(m) For the purpose of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any public-housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families may extend a prior preference to such families: *Provided*, That as among such families, the 'First' preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply.

(c) Section 15 of said act is hereby amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" in subparagraph (5) thereof, the following: "or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families."

FARM-LABOR CAMPS

SEC. 405. Section 12 of said act is hereby amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (f) thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, upon the filing of a request therefor within 12 months after the effective date of this sentence, the Authority shall relinquish, transfer, and convey, without monetary consideration, all of its rights, title, and interest in and with respect to any such project or any part thereof (including such land as is determined by the Authority to be reasonably necessary to the operation of such project and contractual rights to revenues, reserves, and other proceeds therefrom) to any public-housing agency whose area of operation includes the project, upon a finding and certification by the public-housing agency (which shall be conclusive upon the Authority) that the project is needed to house persons and families of low income and that preference for occupancy in the project will be given first to low-income agricultural workers and their families and second to other low-income persons and their families. Upon the relinquishment and transfer of any such project it shall cease to be a low-rent project within the meaning of this act, and the Authority shall have no further jurisdiction over the same, except that in any conveyance hereunder the Authority may reserve to the United States of America any mineral rights of whatsoever nature upon, in, or under the property, including the right of access to and the use of such parts of the surface of the property as may be necessary for mining and saving the minerals. Any project or part thereof not relinquished or conveyed or under a contract for disposal pursuant to this subsection shall be disposed of by the Authority pursuant to subsection (e) of section 13 of this act, notwithstanding the parenthetical clause in said subsection."

DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956, all right, title, and interest, including contractual rights and obligations and any reversionary interest, held by the Federal Government in and with respect to all real and personal property comprising the following housing projects:

Project No.:	Location
Ala-1D1	Ozark, Ala.
Ala-1D2	Ozark, Ala.
Ala-2D1	Foley, Ala.
Ala-2D2	Foley, Ala.
Ariz-1D1	Yuma, Ariz.
Ariz-1D2	Yuma, Ariz.
Ariz-3D1	Flagstaff, Ariz.
Cal-3D1	Oceanside, Calif.
Cal-3D2	Oceanside, Calif.
Cal-4D1	Miramar, Calif.
Cal-6D1	San Ysidro, Calif.
Cal-7D2	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-9D1	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-9D2	Barstow, Calif.
Cal-10D1	Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.
Colo-1D1	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Fla-2D1	Green Cove Springs, Fla
Fla-4D1	Milton, Fla.
Fla-8032	Pensacola, Fla.
Fla-8084	Pensacola, Fla.
Ga-1D1	Hinesville, Ga.
Kan-3D1	Hutchinson, Kans.
Me-4D1	Brunswick, Maine
Md-1D1	Bainbridge, Md.
Mo-1D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-2D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-4D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Mo-5D1	Waynesville, Mo.
Nev-2D1	Fallon, Nev.
NC-1D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-3D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-4D1	Elizabeth City, N. C.
Pa-36011	Philadelphia, Pa.
Pa-36012	Philadelphia, Pa.
RI-1D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
RI-2D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
Tex-2D1	Kingsville, Tex.
Tex-3D1	Hondo, Tex.
Tex-5D1	Beesville, Tex.
Tex-5D2	Beesville, Tex.
Tex-6D1	Mission, Tex.
Va-6D1	Quantico, Va.
Va-10D1	Yorktown, Va.
Va-12D1	Yorktown, Va.
Va-13D1	Williamsburg, Va.

The provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, and of the act entitled "An act to expedite the pro-

vision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not apply to any property transferred hereunder and, except as otherwise provided herein, the laws relating to similar property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property transferred.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, which is not transferred under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall, as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957, be disposed of on a competitive-bid basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair-market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation: *Provided*, That project No. IDA–2D1 at Colbalt, Idaho, shall be sold only for use on the site.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby directed to convey housing project No. RK–37013 to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, R. I., pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the project in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect to 360 dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for 3 years after the date of conveyance and to give 30 days' advance notice of available vacancies to such designee.

SEC. 407. The act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 614:

"SEC. 614 (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, (1) any housing to be sold onsite determined by the Administrator to be permanent, located on lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of by the Administrator under other provisions of this act or under the provisions of other law by January 1, 1957, except housing which is determined by the Administrator by that date to be suitable for sale in accordance with section 607 (b) of this act; and (2) any permanent housing to be sold offsite which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold, or otherwise disposed of prior to the effective date of this section shall be disposed of, as expeditiously as possible, on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, all contracts entered into after the enactment of this section for the sale, transfer, or other disposal of housing (other than housing subject to the provisions of section 607 (b) of this act) determined by the Administrator to be permanent, except contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall require that if title does not pass to the purchaser by April 1, 1957 (or within 60 days thereafter if such time is necessary to cure defects in title in accordance with the provisions of the contract), the rights of the purchaser shall terminate and thereafter the housing shall be sold under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, title shall be considered to have passed upon the execution of a conditional sales contract.

"(c) The dates set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be subject to change by virtue of the proivsions of section 611 of this act.".

TITLE V—COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 501. Subsection (d) of section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$500,000,000" and inserting "$600,000,000."

SEC. 502. Subsection (c) of said section 401 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the facility, as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by him; and with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate equal to the total of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest then chargeable by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e) of this section."

SEC. 503. Subsection (e) of said section 401 is hereby amended by striking the second sentence and substituting the following: "Such notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loan contracts entered into after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the annual rate for each calendar quarter as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of February or May or August or November, as the case may be, next preceding each such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of February or May or August or November, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

HOUSING DATA

SEC. 601. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby specifically authorized to undertake such surveys, studies, and compilations and analyses of statistical data and other information as he determines to be necessary in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. In discharging this responsibility, the Administrator may utilize the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and such departments, establishments, and agencies shall confer with and advise the Administrator, at his request, on improvements in any existing or proposed systems and techniques for gathering and reporting housing and related data. The Administrator may disseminate (without regard to the provisions of 39 United States Code 321n) any data or information, acquired or held under this section, in such form as he shall determine to be most useful to departments, establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments, to industry, and to the general public. Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, or any other provision of law.

The summary presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

SUMMARY—HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The housing amendments of 1956 would provide new assistance to housing for the elderly both through the FHA mortgage insurance programs and the low-rent public-housing program. Sufficient mortgage insurance authorization would be provided for another year of FHA operations and the FHA military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis. An additional 70,000 units of low-rent public housing, to be contracted for over a 2-year period, would be authorized for communities which will participate in an integrated attack on slums and blight. Urban renewal would be given new assistance through the liberalization of FHA insurance terms for the repair and rehabilitation of housing and the provision of low-cost housing for families displaced by urban renewal. In addition, the authorization for Federal grants to State and regional planning agencies to assist urban planning would be doubled. The Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary mortgage market operations would be broadened. The authorization for college housing loans would be increased and changes made in the program to encourage more participation by private lenders. New provisions would be enacted to expedite the disposal of the remaining defense and World War II housing and other properties still held by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A number of other perfecting changes would be made in the laws governing the programs of that agency.

Following is a brief summary of the provisions of the housing amendments of 1956 in the order in which they appear in the bill:

FHA TITLE I HOME REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The FHA title I home repair and improvement program would be amended to—

1. Eliminate the expiration date of the program (September 30, 1956) and make the program permanent;

2. Increase the maximum amounts of the loans which can be insured under the program from $2,500 to $3,500 for home improvement and nonresidential loans, and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans for the improvement of structures housing two or more families; and

3. Authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to increase the maximum term of home improvement and nonresidential loans from 3 years (the present limit) up to 5 years, if he determines that such increase is in the public interest.

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

The Federal Housing Commissioner would be authorized to establish a fire and hazard loss fund to provide self-insurance coverage with respect to real property acquired by FHA under any of its programs.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

The regular FHA section 203 sales housing program would be amended to permit a third party to provide the downpayment required for the purchase of a home where the mortgagor would be a person 60 years of age or older. Combined with existing authority, the third party could make the downpayment and also become a cosigner of the mortgage note for an elderly person lacking adequate credit.

The FHA section 207 rental housing program would be amended to provide liberal

mortgage insurance for multifamily housing where at least 25 percent of the units in the project are expressly designed for the use of the elderly and a priority of occupancy for these units is given to the elderly throughout the life of the mortgage insurance contract. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be 90 percent of value where the mortgage does not exceed $7,200 per family unit without regard to the present requirements as to the average number of bedrooms.

A second amendment of the FHA section 207 rental housing program would provide more liberal mortgage insurance for multifamily housing designed and held entirely for elderly persons and sponsored by nonprofit organizations approved by the FHA as to financial responsibility. The maximum amount of the mortgage in these cases would be $8,100 per dwelling unit and the mortgage could be 90 percent of replacement cost instead of 90 percent of value.

GENERAL FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The FHA mortgage insurance authorization would be increased to make available $3 billion of this authorization for the next fiscal year. The balance of the present authorization would be included in this amount.

LIBERALIZATION OF SECTION 221 LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

The FHA section 221 program for the housing of displaced families (for both single family homes, and for multifamily housing of nonprofit corporations) would be liberalized—

1. By increasing the maximum amount of mortgages which can be insured from $7,600 to $8,000 per dwelling unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling unit in high-cost areas;

2. To permit the mortgage to equal the value of the property except that the mortgagor, in the case of a single-family home, would be required to make an initial payment of $200 in cash or its equivalent, which amount could include settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses (present maximum is 95 percent of value and downpayment of 5 percent of estimated cost on single-family homes); and

3. By increasing the maximum maturity of the mortgage from 30 years to 40 years.

APPROVAL OF COST CERTIFICATIONS MADE FINAL

The cost certification of a mortgagor with respect to a multifamily housing project would be made final and incontestable after the Federal Housing Commissioner had approved the certification, except where there is fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor. It would also be made clear that allocations of general overhead items can be included as part of the actual cost of the project. These amendments would remove doubts and fears on the part of prospective sponsors of multifamily housing that their cost certifications may be reexamined and questioned from time to time over an indefinite period of years and as to what can be included in the cost of a project for cost-certification purposes.

EXTENSION OF THE CAPEHART MILITARY HOUSING PROGRAM

The FHA mortgage insurance authority for the Capehart military housing program would be extended on a permanent basis.

FNMA SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

The present $15,000 limit on the amount of an FHA or VA mortgage which can be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association would be removed with respect to mortgages purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations. The $15,000 limit would continue to be applicable to mortgages offered by FNMA purchase under the special assistance functions of FNMA, except where the mortgages cover property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii. The principal amount of any mortgage purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations, including Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii mortgages, would of course be limited by the amount permitted under FHA insurance or VA guaranty legislation.

REDUCTION IN CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION TO FNMA BY MORTGAGE SELLERS MADE POSSIBLE

The present requirement that mortgage sellers must subscribe to FNMA common stock in an amount equal to 3 percent of the unpaid amount of the mortgages, or such greater percentages as may from time to time be determined by FNMA, would be changed. The amendment would provide that sellers of mortgages to FNMA under its secondary market operations would be required to make capital contributions to FNMA equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amount of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association, or such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent, as may from time to time be determined by the Association, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy.

MORTGAGE PURCHASE PRICES TO BE ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE RANGE OF MARKET PRICES

FNMA would be authorized to establish the prices to be paid for mortgages purchased in its secondary market operations within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved instead of at the market price as presently required.

URBAN RENEWAL PLANS

An unnecessary requirement would be removed from the present law under which an identifiable urban redevelopment plan must be part of an urban renewal plan if redevelopment of part of the urban renewal area is planned along with rehabilitation and conservation of the balance of the area.

CHANGES IN DEFINITION OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

The definition of urban renewal project in the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, would be amended to make the whole urban renewal areas (instead of merely the area to be cleared, as under present law) subject to the predominantly residential requirement. Under the present predominantly residential requirement, an urban redevelopment area (i. e., the area to be cleared) must, with certain exceptions, either be predominantly residential to begin with or else be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This change would thus make the requirement consistent with other requirements in title I which apply to the whole urban renewal area. The definition would also be amended to consolidate the provisions relating to slum clearance and redevelopment with those relating to rehabilitation and conservation.

LOSS OF CERTAIN TAX REVENUES AS URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT COST

A new provision would permit an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes on real property acquired by a local public agency in an urban renewal project to be included in the gross project cost if the local public agency has not paid such taxes or made payments in lieu of taxes during the time the real property was in its possession. This would provide for equitable treatment as between communities which receive tax payments on real property held by a local public agency and those which do not.

URBAN RENEWAL IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

The Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

URBAN PLANNING AUTHORIZATION INCREASED

The urban planning grant authorization would be increased from $5 million to $10 million.

SEVENTY THOUSAND ADDITIONAL LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED

New loan and annual contributions contracts would be authorized for not more than 35,000 additional low-rent public housing units after July 31, 1956, and an additional 35,000 on and after July 1, 1957. Each 35,000 increment would be available for contracting until 2 years after it first becomes available.

WORKABLE PROGRAM REQUIREMENT RESTORED FOR LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The previous requirement that the locality must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums before a contract could be entered into for Federal assistance to low-rent public housing (which was dropped by the Housing Amendments of 1955) would be restored to the law.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Single persons 65 years of age or over with low incomes would be made eligible for low-rent public housing units, and local housing authorities would also be permitted to extend a prior preference, as among low-income families which are eligible applicants for occupancy of dwellings of given sizes and at specified rents, to elderly families (including single persons 65 years of age or over) for any low-rent housing designed specially for, or suitable to the needs of, such elderly families. As among applicants eligible for this preference, those displaced by slum clearance or other governmental action would be given a first preference. The limit of $1,750 per room on the cost of low-rent public housing would be increased to $2,250 per room where units are designed specifically for elderly families.

TRANSFER OF FARM LABOR CAMPS

The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

DISPOSAL OF DEFENSE HOUSING

Provision would be made for the disposal of the temporary or relocatable Korean defense housing projects still held by the housing agency—about 10,000 units. Forty-two of these projects, plus three World War II projects (on or near military reservations), needed for continuing use by military personnel would be transferred to the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956. The remainder of this defense housing held by the housing agency would be sold to the highest bidder not later than June 30, 1957 (unless previously disposed of under other

provisions of law). The Tonomy Hill World War II project at Newport, R. I., would be transferred to the local housing authority. However, a first preference would have to be given to military personnel in a certain number of units in that project for 3 years.

MODIFICATION OF WAR HOUSING SALES PREFERENCE PROVISIONS

A new provision would be added to the Lanham Act designed to accelerate the disposition of two classes of permanent war housing. One class consists of housing which is to be sold for removal from the site. The other consists of projects to be sold onsite which cannot be subdivided in such a manner as to offer for separate sale dwelling structures designed for occupancy by not more than four families. In the first class of housing the existing sales preference requirements would be eliminated effective upon enactment of the bill, and in the second class, all preference requirements would be terminated with respect to the onsite sale of the nondivisible projects which the Housing Agency holds on January 1, 1957, as of that date. All housing disposed of under the new provision must be disposed of as expeditiously as possible on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder, except that the Housing Administrator may reject any bid which he determines to be less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

INCREASE IN COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN FUND AUTHORIZATION

The college housing revolving loan fund authorization would be increased from $500 million to $600 million.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES—COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

The formula in the present law with respect to the interest rate paid by the Housing Administrator on funds borrowed from the United States Treasury for college housing loans would be changed to provide that such funds shall bear interest at a rate, calculated each calendar quarter, based on the current average market yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a remaining maturity of 15 or more years. This formula would be in place of the formula now in the law which bases the interest rate on the average rate borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, irrespective of maturity, as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, or 2½ percent, whichever is higher. The rate proposed by the bill would currently result in the Housing Administrator paying 2⅞ percent on funds borrowed from the Treasury. Under the present law, the rate for fiscal year 1956 is 2½ percent.

The bill would also require the Housing Administrator, in making college housing loans, to charge a rate equal to that payable by him to the Treasury plus one-fourth of 1 percent. The present law provides for a similar spread, except that if the resulting rate is less than 2¾ percent, the higher rate must be charged. Because of the different base to which the one-fourth percent differential would be applied under the bill as compared with the present law, the net result of the bill, under current market conditions, would be to change the college housing loan interest rate from 2¾ percent to 3⅛ percent.

These changes are designed to increase participation by private lenders in bond issues sold by colleges to finance college housing construction.

HOUSING DATA

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized to undertake such surveys, studies, and compilations and analyses of statistical data and other information as he determines to be necessary in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. He would utilize the available facilities of other Government agencies, and such agencies would be required to confer with and advise the Administrator, at his request, on improvements in any existing or proposed systems and techniques for gathering and reporting housing and related data.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION IN CERTAIN REEMPLOYMENT CASES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases.

This bill is designed to clarify and confirm the jurisdiction with which the Federal courts are vested to enforce the reemployment rights granted by section 9 (g) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act—title 50, United States Code, Appendix, section 451 and the following—to certain reservists and persons who have been rejected for military service.

The Federal district court for the District of Colorado, in the case of *Christner v. Poudre Valley Cooperative* (134 F. Supp. 115), decided on July 13, 1955, that the court is without jurisdiction to enforce section 9 (g) (3) which, unlike sections 9 (g) (1) and 9 (g) (2) does not specifically refer to the rights and benefits provided by section 9 generally.

The statute provides that employees covered by the section—in the main, reservists called up for training duty only—shall be granted a leave of absence by their employers for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining physical fitness to enter or performing training duty in the Armed Forces. Upon their release from training duty or rejection, and after making proper application, these employees are entitled to be reinstated in their positions.

While comparatively few cases under section 9 (g) (3) have been presented for litigation, the existence of a clearly recognized remedy in the Federal courts under reemployment legislation is believed to be of vital importance in minimizing litigation and facilitating the administration and enforcement of this phase of the act.

Section 9 (d) of the act, as originally enacted in 1948, conferred jurisdiction upon Federal courts to enforce compliance with the provisions of sections 9 (b) and 9 (c) (1) of the act. The act, as it now stands, also includes three other sections—9 (g) (1), 9 (g) (2), and 9 (g) (3)—granting and defining rights. None of these sections specifically authorizes the Federal courts to enforce the rights it describes. However, sections 9 (g) (1) and 9 (g) (2)—which embrace inductees, enlistees, and reservists on active duty—provide that the persons affected shall be entitled to all reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by section 9 of the act for persons inducted under the section. This reference would, of course, include enforcement rights under section 9 (d).

An appeal from the Christener decision has been taken by the Department of Justice and is now pending in the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. However, the matter may not be finally resolved by this appellate court for many months. In the interim, as long as the decision of the district court stands, reservists and rejectees covered by section 9 (g) (3) of the act may, in many instances, find reemployment delayed or denied upon their return from the Armed Forces. In other jurisdictions, employers and the courts might tend to be influenced by the precedent of the Christener case. The reversal of the district court would still leave a situation in which the question of jurisdiction can be raised in each of the other nine circuits. Thus, the thousands of reservists who are called up periodically to serve short periods of training duty, or merely for the determination of their physical fitness, may be confronted with obstacles which Congress sought to eliminate in facilitating their orderly return to civilian employment. This result would be disruptive of the reemployment pattern which is so important a feature of the act.

To prevent hardship to trainees and rejectees who may be denied rights because of the Christener decision and to guide employers who might incur liability through following that decision, I am introducing this bill in the hope that this correction will be approved by Congress as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, which is very brief, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3307) to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "this section."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of June 19, 1951.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953—AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today a list of 86 persons for appointment, promotion, and designation in the Foreign Service of the United States. I desire to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION ON TOMORROW OF SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was my intention today to request unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for not to exceed 15 minutes, in reply to the speech made yesterday of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], attacking Secretary of State Dulles. However, Mr. President, in light of the tragic death of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, HARLEY KILGORE, and after consulting with the majority leader and the minority leader, I have decided to postpone my remarks until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I be given the floor for 15 minutes, after the close of the morning business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and I wholeheartedly concur in his request. I want the distinguished Senator from New Jersey to realize that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] holds the floor, after the morning hour; and it is possible that he will still be speaking on tomorrow. But I think I am at liberty to say that I believe he will have no objection to the allowance of 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey. Therefore, I hope the request of the Senator from New Jersey will be granted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAJ. GEN. DENNIS A. NOLAN

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, today in Arlington Cemetery there was laid to rest a great American soldier and patriot—Maj. Gen. Dennis A. Nolan.

During his long and brilliant military career, General Nolan saw service in many parts of the world. In World War I, he was chief of military intelligence under General Pershing.

In October 1918, General Nolan was in command of the 55th Infantry Brigade of the 28th Division, the renowned Iron Division of the Pennsylvania National Guard, in which I had the honor of commanding a regiment. At that time the Germans were making desperate efforts to repulse the fresh advances of our troops in their march to victory in the Meuse-Argonne campaign. In that terrific struggle General Nolan demonstrated his genius as a military tactician. In addition, he exhibited bravery of an exemplary character. He was literally on the front line at all times, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in personally directing the movements of his tanks under machinegun and artillery fire.

General Nolan was an inspiring leader and an outstanding American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a biographical sketch outlining General Nolan's distinguished military and civic career.

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

Gen. Dennis A. Nolan was born in Akron, N. Y., on April 22, 1872. At West Point he distinguished himself as an All-American end on the football team and as left-fielder on the baseball team.

Two years after his graduation from the military academy in 1896, he was fighting against the Spaniards in Cuba and won the Silver Star for bravery. The next year, he commanded a cavalry squadron in the Philippine Insurrection.

He was promoted to first lieutenant December 4, 1898; to captain July 6, 1901; to major July 1, 1916; to lieutenant colonel January 1, 1920, and to brigadier general July 3, 1920, but this was a recess appointment and expired March 4, 1921. While serving in France he had the temporary rank of brigadier general. He was reappointed brigadier general April 27, 1921, and was made a major general January 18, 1925.

He was on duty with the War Department in April 1917, when the United States entered World War I. The next month he sailed for France with General Pershing, and organized the military intelligence unit for the American Expeditionary Forces.

General Nolan's work as intelligence chief won him the Distinguished Service Medal. France gave him the Croix de Guerre and Britain made him a Commander of the Bath. Other decorations were conferred upon him by Italy, Belgium and the Republic of Panama.

After the war, General Nolan served on a subcommittee of the Peace Conference drafting details of German disarmament. In 1926 and 1927, he was deputy chief of staff and served on the American delegation to the Commission on Reduction of Armaments at Geneva.

From 1927 to 1931, General Nolan commanded the Fifth Corps Area with headquarters at Columbus, Ohio. From 1931 until his retirement in 1936, at the age of 65, he commanded the Second Corps Area with headquarters on Governors Island, N. Y.

After retirement, General Nolan turned to civic activities and directed his efforts toward building the defensive strength of America on every front. For 7 years he served as chairman of the Citizens Budget Commission of New York, working for budget reductions and economy in city, State, and Federal Government.

THE TERRIBLE TOLL OF ACCIDENTS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year our Nation suffers a severe and largely avoidable toll because of accidents. One such sphere of accidents is regrettably in American industry.

The latest estimates are that in 1955, almost 2 million American workers were disabled, and in 14,200 instances were killed, by on-the-job injuries. 1.8 million employees suffered injuries which disabled them at least a full day. 76,800 suffered permanent physical impairments.

This, Mr. President, is a shocking toll. Of course, American industry is on the lookout toward reducing this toll to the greatest possible extent. United States management has installed all sorts of safety devices, and procedures have been adopted for the widest range of precautions. However, it is obvious that there is still abundant room for further efforts to cut down the accident toll.

I send to the desk the text of an article published in the Thursday, February 23 issue of the newspaper Labor's Daily. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

DEATH, ACCIDENT RATE ON JOB HIGH IN 1955

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 2 million workers were killed or disabled by on-the-job injuries during 1955, according to survey estimates by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The approximate estimate was 1,930,000 of whom 14,200 or more were killed and 76,800 suffered permanent physical impairments ranking from an amputation of a finger to complete and permanent disability.

The other 1,839,000 received injuries which disabled them at least a full day; the average disability was about 17 days.

The total loss to the Nation and to the injured workers in production time during the year was some 39 million man-days. (This was about a third more than the time loss through strikes and lockouts.)

And an estimate of the total loss over future potential productive years, when the deaths and permanent disabilities are figured in, is some 193 million man-days.

The figures were higher than those of the previous year, mainly because of a higher rate of employment and slightly longer hours of work, the bureau said.

Only a few thousand more Americans were killed during the entire Korean war.

The most dangerous occupations are farming, mining, and logging.

The latter traditionally has the highest rate of disability per man-hours worked while mining has the highest rate of deaths per man-hour worked.

There were 413 coal miners killed during the year, and some 19,710 badly injured. By far the largest segment of the deaths was caused by roof falls.

Estimates of deaths by industry:

Agriculture, 3,700; contract construction, 2,400; Government service and miscellaneous, 2,300; manufacturing, 2,100; trade, 1,400; transportation, 1,300; mining, 800; public utilities, 200.

The agriculture figures are an absolute minimum, since injuries and deaths received doing daily chores were not counted.

Here are the occupations which are most dangerous, according to the rate of disabling work injuries per man-hours worked, in order of frequency; logging, iron mining, coal mining, lumber working, garbage collecting, trucking and warehousing, fire fighting, police jobs, special trade construction, heavy construction (not highway), water supply jobs, lumber trades, dairy trades.

The safest jobs are in telephone communications, banks and insurance work, radio, and telecasting, apparel trades, general merchandising and manufacturing of electrical machinery and instruments, in that order.

DEMOCRATIC CRITICISM OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I listened in this Chamber yesterday to an unfortunate speech by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and to supporting statements by four of his Democratic colleagues. The speech and statements were, in my opinion, an unwarranted partisan attack upon our Secretary of State and the foreign policies so ably carried on by him.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I heard the testimony of the Secretary of State before that committee on last Friday. Under the sharpest kind of partisan questioning, the whole of the Secretary's testimony was distorted for purposes of a partisan attack. On Sunday the Secretary of State in a prepared speech amplified and stated with admirable clarity the very policies which were under attack on the Senate floor yesterday. Yet none of his attackers saw fit even to refer to that speech, but they contented themselves with attacks on a few words taken out of context, rather than the whole of what he has said on the subject.

It is not my purpose today to inject a partisan note into these proceedings. It is my purpose only to serve notice that I shall at the next session of this body undertake to demonstrate that yesterday's attacks upon the Secretary of State have been motivated by partisanship and are based on a deliberate distortion of the Secretary's own policies.

I can understand why the Senator from Arkansas and his Democratic colleagues feel that the success of Secretary Dulles' policies are bad campaign politics for their party. But I regret their making that success a partisan issue. I am certain that the Amercan people will regard his successes as good news for the country.

HIGH COST POWER MEANS END OF NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the water which courses down the Columbia River and its tributaries is the most valuable natural asset of the Pacific Northwest States. The extent to which it is developed and utilized by man is the yardstick by which the region's material progress can be measured. Throughout our region's history the Columbia has been our major transportation artery. Along its banks, our cities have risen and farms have spread. But the Columbia also has great impact on the lives of people in an industrial economy. The Columbia and its tributary streams are the region's only source of energy to drive factory wheels, smelt aluminum, or do the thousand-and-one other chores of a mechanized age.

Last fall I had an opportunity to discuss the value of our vast supply of falling water in a series of "partnership" debates in the eastern section of Oregon. I pointed out repeatedly that our region could never become an industrial empire if it sacrificed the prevailing Bonneville rate for industries of 2.2 mills a kilowatt-hour in favor the the average Pacific Power & Light Co. industrial rate of 8.2 mills. Low-cost power is the key to achieving full economic maturity in the Pacific Northwest. When such a huge potential exists for low-cost power, the imposing of high electric rates would have the same effect on our region as if the growth of a child were stopped at the age of 12.

My warning, of course, has been disregarded at Hells Canyon, where Idaho Power Co., with the highest rates of any major utility in the Northwest, is taking over the magnificent Hells Canyon high dam site. Hells Canyon should have become part of the 2.2-mill Bonneville power system.

Now comes ominous news for the Pacific Northwest.

The Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. and the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. have announced that they can buy power from improved new steam plants in the Ohio Valley for 4 mills a kilowatt-hour. I do not intend to convey the thought that regions with great coal-bearing bodies should not be permitted to reach their full economic potential. But, this development has great significance for the Pacific Northwest States.

It is an announcement of grim foreboding for Oregon and the State of Washington, particularly since the policies of Interior Secretary McKay has doomed new Federal starts like Hells Canyon Dam for the Bonneville power network.

D. A. Rhoades, Kaiser general manager, made this disturbing statement:

> The real significance lies in the fact that the aluminum industry is no longer dependent upon locations close to large hydroelectric installations which are remote from industrial markets. We are convinced that it is a turning point for the rapidly expanding aluminum industry.

And I am convinced that this is a turning point for the Pacific Northwest—downward. Steam power at 4 mills in the Ohio Valley, plus favoritism in the Northwest to the private utilities with their 8.2-mill industrial rates, can only result in the drying up of our region's one brightest hope for a source of new payrolls to absorb the employment slack taking place in lumber.

I have quoted many times from the Stanford Research Institute report, which announced that aluminum had brought 85,000 new jobs to our Northwest—needed jobs and permanent payrolls. But this expansion slackened as we ran out of new generators to come onto the line. With the dams started by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman being finished and their capacity gobbled up, what would our region do for low-cost power?

Secretary McKay choked off new Federal starts so the private utilities could preempt such choice sites as Hells Canyon and John Day, either through "partnership" or outright surrender.

Now the chickens have come home to roost, so soon. We are running out of additional supplies of 2.2-mill Bonneville kilowatt-hours for industry. The administration holds that the only possible replacements are kilowatt-hours of the Pacific Power & Light variety, at an average industrial price of 8.2 mills. But Kaiser and Olin Mathieson can buy steam energy in the Ohio Valley, right at the back door of the consuming centers of America, for 4 mills.

Mr. President, I can only conclude and mourn that the harm that Douglas McKay has done to the once-glowing future of his own native region will live on and cause economic hardship long after he has left the Interior Department.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Sunday, February 26, 1956, by Mr. Gene Smith, with regard to the competition between Ohio Valley power and that of the Pacific Northwest.

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

COAL CATCHES UP TO WATERPOWER—ADVANCES MEAN OHIO VALLEY ELECTRICITY CAN COMPETE WITH NORTHWEST'S

(By Gene Smith)

King Coal won't take a back seat to atomic energy or Northwest water resources for electric-power generation.

That is the significance to the electric utilities of recent announcements of major aluminum-production projects in the Ohio River Valley.

Basically, power-producing technology has reached the point where utilities can offer potential heavy electric users power at about 4 mills a kilowatt-hour in the industrial Ohio River Valley. Hydroelectric power at 2.2 mills from Federal dams in the Northwest no longer enjoys its competitive advantage when the cost of transporting finished items to the East is included.

Technical efficiencies realized last year, for example, resulted in a 3-percent drop from the 1954 level in the rate for electricity produced with coal. This meant that it took only 0.96 pound of coal to generate 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. The 1954 figure was 0.99 pound and compared with 1.29 pounds in 1946 and 1.38 pounds in 1939.

KAISER LED MOVE

The Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. led the trek to the Ohio Valley in early December when it announced plans for a $120-million aluminum reduction plant to be built at Ravenswood, W. Va., on the Ohio River.

Less than a month later the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. confirmed its plans for an aluminum plant on the Ohio near Clarington, Ohio. It, too, will cost $120 milion.

Behind the two projects—and the expected announcement of a third major aluminum plant in the area—was a 6-year study of the power supply problem by the Ohio Power Co., a subsidiary of the American Gas & Electric Co.

The findings of this study indicated that gas as a fuel for driving turbines was due to go up in price and that most of the economically feasible hydroelectric sites already had been developed.

"This brings coal and coal-based generation sharply into the picture," according to Philip Sporn, president of American Gas, a utility holding company. "Where this coal lies on navigable water, and this is true in a large section of the Ohio Valley, it offers today an ideal combination of favorable economic factors for the development of large-scale economical coal supplies required in large aluminum reduction operations."

Both aluminum plants will be situated at sites where coal reserves of 50 to 100 years have been made available, thus assuring uninterrupted power, a major complaint of

aluminum operators dependent on the whims or hydroelectric power.

Kaiser's contract with Ohio Power calls for the availability of 450,000 kilowatts for 40 years. Olin's contract emphasizes even more the coal tie because it involves operation of a major deep-rim coal mine at the power site, plus construction of a coal carbonization plant that will provide a more economical boiler fuel known as char. This cokelike residue from the distillation of coal will be fed directly to the boilers by conveyor belt, a further example of new technologies in power production.

The Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., which will own and operate the mill and mine, plans an initial capacity of 2 million tons of coal a year, rising to three times that figure later.

WATERWAYS ARE NEAR

D. A. Rhoades, vice president and general manager of Kaiser, explained that the nearness of navigable waterways also meant that the mill would be connected with its alumina plants and Jamaica, British West Indies, bauxite mines by economical shipping.

Explaining his company's shift from the Northwest, Mr. Rhoades said: "The real significance of this combination lies in the fact that the aluminum industry is no longer dependent upon locations close to large hydroelectric installations which are remote from industrial markets. We are convinced that this development will greatly influence and benefit the domestic aluminum production pattern of the future. We believe that it is a turning point for the rapidly expanding aluminum industry."

American Gas & Electric further emphasized its belief in the future of coal by announcing 2 days after the Olin plans had been disclosed that the Appalachian Electric Power Co., another operating subsidiary, would build a $55 million steam-electric plant at Carbo, Va. This also will be situated on property owned by a coal company, Clinchfield Coal Corp. Clinchfield has set aside 40 million tons of coal from its adjacent reserves to supply the powerplant.

"There is every reason to believe that the two aluminum projects will be followed by still further developments in the Ohio Valley in aluminum and other chemical, electrochemical, and electrometallurgical operations which require large quantities of power," Mr. Sporn predicted.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, justice and freedom of political sovereignty demand that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted to the Union. A most cogent and effective editorial urging such a step appeared in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., for February 24, 1956. In my opinion, the editorial is particularly significant because, in the past, the Oregonian has not been especially friendly to statehood for Alaska. Yet it is the case for Alaska which is emphasized in the Oregonian's presentation of the problem.

The editorial concludes:

With the major objections removed, it seems clear to us that statehood would confer a boon on Alaskans and consequently on those States, like Oregon, which are in close communication with Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Alaska, Hawaii Both Ready for Elevation to Statehood," be included in the body of the RECORD.

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

ALASKA, HAWAII BOTH READY FOR ELEVATION TO STATEHOOD

It has been the view of the Oregonian that, because of its relatively greater development, Hawaii should precede Alaska into statehood. This page has also advocated independent consideration of the two statehood proposals because of the patently different considerations involved. Those convictions remain unchanged. But the time has come for this important qualification: Alaska is ready for statehood, and should at the earliest possible moment follow Hawaii into that higher estate.

In the past we have urged deliberation in acting on Alaskan statehood, primarily for two good reasons: (1) The Territory, 99 percent of whose area is owned by the Federal Government, lacks in its own right the resources to support itself as an independent State; (2) there has been a question of the possibly adverse effect of statehood on the Nation's defense outposts in Alaska.

It is our firm belief that these objections are no longer overriding, that the pending statehood legislation, as it pertains to Alaska, provides substantially for all essentials to qualify the Territory for a place in the Union.

Consider first the ability of the State of Alaska, as projected, to pay its way:

The current annual cost to the United States of administering the Territory through the Department of the Interior is approximately $28,500,000, just slightly more than Alaska's own Territorial budget. But only about a third of this amount would be transferred to the responsibility of the new State. The remainder is composed of appropriations for activities such as are carried on a Federal expense in other Western States.

The bulk of the burden to be transferred to the State stems from the highway program. Interior is spending $9,800,000 on Alaskan highways this year. The statehood bill, however, makes allowance for gradual assumption of the highway chore by the State; and, in the first fiscal year after admission, the Federal contribution would be $20 million, more than twice the current level. This figure would decline to $1 million in the 15th year, the last of the special Federal subsidy.

It should also be understood that, as a state, Alaska would qualify for Federal highway aid, which it does not receive as a Territory although its citizens pay all Federal taxes including gasoline tax. Since the total acreage of Federal holdings in Alaska is so tremendous, the State would have a comparatively favorable matching formula. Construction costs would be borne 86.34 percent by the Federal Government and 13.66 percent by the State.

The State government would also assume costs of the governor's office ($95,000 annually) and legislative expenses ($48,000 every other year). The only other major new expenditure for the State would be for the hospitalization of the insane. Transfer of this responsibility is already projected in a bill that passed the House of Representatives January 18. The legislation provides for Federal grants totaling $12 million for a transition period of 10 years. This would be ample to cover all anticipated costs in that time.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has calculated that, with the interim Federal assistance provided by statehood legislation, Alaska, as a State, would intially have a budget of only about $2 million a year higher than its 1955 total of $28,484,917. This would not be intolerable, especially in light of the fact that the Territory had a surplus of $6 million at the beginning of the current fiscal year.

Moreover, pending legislation makes generous provision for land grants for the enrichment of the new State. The Federal Government would make available to Alaska a total of 103,350,000 acres, or approximately 30 percent of all land area. The State government would have wide discretion to select land in the following categories: 800,000 acres from national forest and other public lands adjacent to established communities (for urban expansion); 2,550,000 acres for specific purposes, such as schools, hospitals, and other public institutions; 100 million acres to be used as the State may elect for lease or sale to private owners for development of resources and other economic potentialities. In the last-named category would be mineral-bearing lands, including those under lease for oil exploration.

Now to the military objection.

The Pentagon's misgivings were expressed before a Senate committee by James H. Douglas, Under Secretary of the Air Force. "I think it is only natural that the Secretary (Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson) has expressed reluctance to lose some degree of flexibility and freedom of action," Mr. Douglas said. "The Secretary is not saying that the defense program will be seriously damaged in the event of Alaskan statehood. He is saying that there are very unusual problems, that we would for the present like to continue to operate in the existing environment to which we have become accustomed."

Having read all the testimony, we cannot take the military objections seriously. They appear to be based on convenience, not necessity. The Pentagon prefers not to be bothered by an Alaskan congressional delegation or a State government in its operation of 3 major air bases, several interceptor stations, 2 naval bases, and a number of radar warning installations. Logic cannot be bent to the support of the Pentagon's position that Alaska is stronger as a Territory than it would be as a State. If it could, then the suggested course would be to return to territorial status such vulnerable frontier States as Oregon, Washington, and California.

Space does not permit the detailing of the many advantages of statehood—the application of self-government, the elimination of the remote control over fisheries, and the monopoly-encouraging restrictions under the Maritime Act of 1920.

With the major objections removed, it seems clear to us that statehood would confer a boon on Alaskans and consequently on those States, like Oregon, which are in close communication with Alaska. Statehood can be achieved, we believe, if Congress will disjoint the Hawaii-Alaska issues and thus prevent the combination of the opponents of each.

Alaska's best bet is to put all of its influence behind Hawaiian statehood. Once that is gained, the 50th star will be within Alaska's reach.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement relative to a recent meeting held by the Inter-American Council of Jurists, dealing with the question of the territorial limits of the inter-American states.

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

The Inter-American Council of Jurists is a specialized body of the Organization of American States. It is composed of specialists in international law and has the func-

tion of advising the OAS on technical phases of the interpretation of international law as it bears on the relations between the Republics of the Americas.

The council met in Mexico City late in January of this year. On its agenda was the item: "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American Conference Provided for in resolution LXXIV of the Caracas Conference."

The council did not make such a study, A group of delegates had gotten together prior to the meeting and devised a resolution which served their narrowly conceived nationalistic aims. Reports reaching me indicate that they rammed the resolution through the council to adoption by deliberately choking off discussion and debate. The distinguished and able delegate of the United States, Counselor of Embassy William Sanders, could do no more than file the following declaration and reservation of the United States of America:

"DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS

"For the reasons stated by the United States representative during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the resolution on territorial waters and related questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

"That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

"That at this meeting of the council of jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

"That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the Specialized Conference called for under resolution LXXIV of the 10th Inter-American Conference;

"That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

"That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

"That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of council of jurists as a technical juridical body.

"In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document."

Among other things the resolution "declares that the acceptance of these principles does not imply and shall not have the effect of renouncing or weakening the position maintained by the various countries of America on the question of how far territorial waters should extend.

"TERRITORIAL WATERS

"1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called 'territorial waters' is justifiable.

"2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense."

It aids in the understanding of what is meant by the world "reasonable" in the above paragraph to know that 3 of the countries whose delegates sponsored this resolution have proclaimed sovereignty to a band of ocean extending to a minimum distance of 200 marine miles off their coasts, and a fourth has proclaimed sovereignty over an area of high seas adjacent to its shores which is in some places nearly 500 miles wide.

I need hardly review for the Members the vital nature of the doctrine of the freedom of the sea and its companion doctrine of a narrow territorial sea to the life of these United States and of western civilization. The free flow of commerce by air and by sea between nations is a necessity of modern life. The unimpeded use of the highways of the air and sea for quick and certain military communication is an absolute necessity in these troubled times if the free world is to be successfully defended.

To keep the seas open for the unimpeded use of our citizens and our Armed Forces was one of the reasons that the colonies engaged in the French and Indian Wars; it formed one of the basic causes for the Revolutionary War; it was for this reason that we engaged in the war with the Barbary pirates; the War of 1812 was fought chiefly on this point; it was to protect this right that we entered the First World War; it was by establishing command over the air and sea that we and our allies were able to bring to a successful conclusion the Second World War and particularly the war in the Pacific. Today we are appropriationg tens of billions of dollars to our defense establishments to enable us and our allies to keep the sea and air free for our use.

Why have we adopted such a policy and pursued it so unswervingly through our history?

Why have the other maritime countries done the same? The reasons are quite simple.

The growing human population of the world has required the efficient use of the world's resources to keep it alive. Centers of population grow in industrialized areas which are too dense to even be fed on local resources. The product of their manufactures must be able to flow to markets all over the world. Centers of food production arise where more food can be grown than can be eaten by the local population. The excess of the harvest must be able to flow to market in centers of industry all over the world. The complicated economic web of exchange of goods between areas of specialized ability to produce is the very basis upon which our civilization has been able to grow. In this postwar period the United States alone has expended billions upon billions of dollars to bolster the economies of its friends and allies. To the extent that impediments are placed in the way of the free flow of goods by air and sea between centers of varied production in the free world, the ability of the free world to prosper, to thrive, to keep strong and vital, and to be able to defend itself by economic means shrinks.

In the proclamations adverted to above by which several nations have sought to establish their sovereignty over broad stretches of the high seas and the air spaces above this vital point has been noted and an attempt has been made to meet it by an accompanying declaration that would grant permission to vessels and aircraft of foreign nationality to pass through such purported areas of sovereignty. This does not, and cannot, meet the point.

The nationals of the world now use these sealanes and airlanes of the world under rights that pertain to them under international law as free and independent sovereigns. They need no permissive grant from another sovereign for that use. Any permission that one sovereign is able to grant to another to pass through its territory it is also able to withdraw or to modify at a later date. In time of peace it could control traffic through its territory or charge fees for it; in time of war it could proclaim neutrality and exclude such traffic.

Accordingly, the United States and the other maritime nations of the world have maintained the doctrine of the freedom of the seas and the air spaces above and have adhered to the doctrine of a narrow territorial sea. This has been done no more for their benefit than for the benefit of smaller, less developed nations. To the extent that a small, underdeveloped country is impeded in getting its produce to market the economic and social development of that country is slowed down. To the extent that a small and militarily weak country is separated by unnecessary and new barriers from its defenders the freedom and independence of that country is placed in jeopardy.

We realize that the use of common places and common resources by different entities brings problems whether it is individuals using the same driveway to their homes or whether it is sovereign nations using common sealanes and airlanes. It is to be expected that that greatest common of all, the high seas which cover nearly three quarters of the globe and are used by nearly every nation, will generate great problems.

The United Nations is at the present time intensively studying this whole subject. Last year the United Nations called together a special International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea in which 50 nations of the world participated. Acting upon the report adopted by that meeting and the results of other multilateral conferences on other branches of this complex subject, the International Law Commission devoted nearly the whole of its 1955 sessions to working out recommendations on the twin subjects of Regime of the High Seas, and Regime of the Territorial Sea. Its recommendations have been submitted for study and comment to all of the members of the United Nations. The International Law Commission will once more devote nearly its whole session this year to revising its recommendations on these subjects in the light of comments it has received during the year from the member nations. Its finalized report will be submitted to the General Assembly this fall, and the subject is already on the General Assembly's calendar for consideration this year. There it will go to committee for study, discussion, and possible alteration before it finally comes to the floor of General Assembly for debate.

Mr. President, these are the normal ways by which independent and free peoples work out problems of relations among themselves and mutually reach conclusions that are mutually agreeable and practical in operation.

This is not, however, the way the Inter-American Council of Jurists has acted on this subject which is of the greatest importance to the United States and to the world. The Council, under the charter of the Organization of American States, is supposed to work as a serious, technical body. Yet it adopted a resolution advancing far-reaching legal pronouncements on vital social, economic, scientific and defense interests of nations, upon which as legally trained persons the delegates were not even qualified to

speak, with virtually no analysis, no study and no discussion.

The United States and other delegations raised basic questions regarding the contents of the resolution, but its proponents chose not to reply to those points or otherwise justify their proposals.

The resolution was drafted to support the thesis of a few Latin American countries which have evidenced a desire to claim large areas of the high seas as part of their sovereign territory. Such claims are without precedent in international law since the 17th century.

The United States has repeatedly protested these claims and actions under them as clearly outside the bounds of international law. These countries have rejected our offer to take the issues to the International Court of Justice and are now trying to impose upon the United States new rules of law which will back up their extravagant claims of 200 miles or more.

There was not even any suggestion in the resolution that the rights of other nations under long-established principles of the freedom of the seas must be respected. The application of this idea would result in chaos in such areas as the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Gulf of Panama, the Mediterranean, the North Sea, the seas off southeast Asia, and other areas of the world where projections of territorial boundaries might overlap.

Mr. President, we are profoundly disturbed not only by the substance of this resolution but by the log-rolling tactics which were used to put it across. It disturbs our very faith in the long-established precedents of relations among the Republics of this hemisphere. We must only hope that the parent organization of the Organization of American States will take such actions as are required to correct the behavior of its technical agency in order that faith in the OAS itself will not be further shaken.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 28, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no further statements Senators may wish to make at this time, I desire to propose a unanimous-consent agreement. But before I do so, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that all Senators may be on notice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are now working toward a solution of what we have come to call the farm problem. The administration, understandably, does not exactly put it that way. The President instead says that our farmers are not now sharing in the general prosperity.

Some of my Texas farm friends put it more directly: They say they have been "Bensonized."

Whatever it is called, Mr. President, it is there and it is unmistakable. Since January 1953, farm prices have fallen from 94 percent of parity to 82 percent of parity. Prices received for crops and livestock have dropped 14 percent. Net income of farmers has fallen from $14 billion in 1952 to $10.3 billion in 1955.

The Secretary of Agriculture has reacted characteristically to these facts. At first it was denied that there was such a thing as a farm problem. It was said those who talk of a farm depression are misinformed. Then, after acknowledgment that such a situation exists, the trouble was said to have been inherited from the previous administration. Then it was blamed on surplus, on incentives, on labor unions, and then, incredibly, on the farmers themselves.

It was suggested that perhaps there are just too many small farmers, that many of them are simply not operating efficiently. This, then, was the theory of natural selection—a sort of survival of the fittest code.

Mr. President, there are plenty of "fit" farmers and ranchers in Texas, and many of them are just barely surviving. A friend of mine writes from south Texas that 80 percent of the ranch people are not making operating expenses—that all hog raisers lost money in 1955.

My friend in south Texas sends along these lines which are currently going the rounds of the country stores and gatepost sessions. They say of the Benson farm program:

A fake and a phoney,
A failure and a fuss,
A fraud on the farmer,
And flexes only one way.

And that one way, Mr. President, is down.

Mr. President, we have before us a farm bill, which has been discussed for several days. Many Members of the Senate are anxious to vote on the bill. Some are ready to vote today, while others are not ready to vote this week.

I had hoped that we would be able to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on next Monday. I have been informed that consent will not be given to vote on Monday or on Tuesday. However, I believe the record should show that on behalf of myself and the minority leader I am submitting a proposed unanimous-consent agreement that effective on Monday, March 5, the limitations on debate shall start to run. Therefore, on behalf of myself and the minority leader I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and I ask that the clerk be instructed to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, March 5, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That when no further amendment is to be proposed, the amendments adopted shall be deemed to be engrossed and the bill read the third time; that a motion shall then be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12, an act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, to which motion the same limitation of debate shall apply as in the case of any other motion or amendment; that in the event the motion to take up the House bill is agreed to, it shall then be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof inserting the provisions of Senate bill 3183 as amended; that the amendment shall be deemed to be engrossed and the House bill as amended read the third time.

Ordered further, That in the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the House bill is not agreed to, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the Senate bill; otherwise it shall proceed to the consideration of the question of the final passage of the House bill, debate on either of which shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the Senate or the House bill, as the case may be, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal with respect to the Senate bill.

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of the House bill as amended, Senate bill 3183 shall be deemed to be postponed indefinitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think anything in the way of legislation is more important than is the farm bill. I have consulted with a group of Senators in regard to the debate to take place on this issue, and I know it is physically impossible to complete the debate by next Monday and agree to any such unanimous-consent request as the one proposed.

For example, I am satisfied that the discussion of one topic in connection with the bill, namely, the problems of the wheat farmer, will take probably all of 2 days, because there happens to be a group of us who intend to make a very detailed record in regard to the plight of the wheat farmers. We feel very strongly that if a two-price plan is sound for some commodities it is particularly sound for wheat. We believe it offers the wheat farmers the best hope, if not the only hope, of remaining economically solvent in the period immediately ahead. I think, important as it is, we should have as early a vote as a complete record

will permit, but agreeing on next Monday as the day for voting is out of the question.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the great tragedy which has struck the membership of the Senate today, and because of which we all grieve, makes it necessary for us to rearrange our schedule somewhat. Therefore, I reluctantly feel it necessary to object to the suggested early date for a vote. I would accept a unanimous-concent agreement to vote on next Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am willing to strike out Monday and insert Wednesday, March 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as modified?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry to propound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Yesterday I submitted an amendment which is designed to prevent any increase in the price of power by any governmental agency over the prices now in effect, for a period of 18 months subsequent to the enactment of the bill. What I should like to ask is whether there is any provision in the unanimous-consent agreement that would prevent my amendment being in order with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the opinion of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment deals with REA projects; does it not?

Mr. KERR. It deals with the price of electric power to the REA cooperatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sufficiently informed on all the details to know whether the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would be germane. Would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry care to express an opinion as to whether it would be germane to the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that it would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader is concerned, and, I hope, the minority leader, I should be willing to modify the agreement to except specifically this one amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I would greatly appreciate that, and on that basis I would have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would raise a question on that point. I do not believe the Senator's amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would be germane. I respectfully suggest to him that during the consideration of the important legislative proposal now before the Senate there is no desire to prevent any amendment dealing with the subject matter, but the provision in the unanimous-consent request relative to germaneness is inserted for the purpose of preventing a wide-open field day after the agreement has been entered into.

I wonder, in view of those circumstances, if the Senator would not feel that it would be better not to have obviously nongermane amendments excepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The best way to ascertain whether it is a germane amendment is, first, to get the advice of the Parliamentarian, because I should like to discuss the other side of the question. We are dealing with economic problems of American farmers, and vital to their problems is not only the cost of electricity, but the assurance that REA's are going to be able to expand and grow because of having reasonably cheap power. I take the position that when we are dealing with a farm bill which has to do with economic problems of the farmers, the Kerr amendment is germane, because what happens to the REA's will influence greatly the economic standards of our farmers.

Before we proceed on the assumption that the amendment is nongermane, Mr. President, I should like to know what the Parliamentarian thinks about it, because I respectfully submit that an amendment which deals with electric rates which the REA's will have to pay for power is germane to a farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the exception would be proper as suggested. However, the Chair holds that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is not germane.

Mr. KERR. I respectfully ask the sponsors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement to exempt my amendment from exclusion. I do not seek to ask them to accept the amendment. I simply do not wish to offer an amendment on one day, and then, under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement entered on the next day, to have consideration of the amendment excluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. KERR. The sole purpose of the amendment is to prevent for a period of 18 months any increase by any governmental agency in existing rates or charges which are made for power sold or delivered to rural-electric cooperatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not this matter be handled in the regular way? This is a subject which normally would be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has not heard any evidence on the question. If the Senator from Oklahoma will introduce a bill designed to correct whatever evil he thinks exists, I will, as chairman of the committee give him assurance that I shall proceed to hold hearings as soon as possible.

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator from Louisiana would do that. The situation developed in this manner. The Department of the Interior advised rural electric cooperatives that the Department was about to file a request with the Federal Power Commission for the confirmation of an increase of about 40 percent in the rates charged to rural electric cooperatives in the Southwest area. Joint hearings on the subject are now in progress before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and of the two similar committees of the House.

It is entirely possible that after the hearings the Department of the Interior eventually will agree to permit Congress to have enough time in which to study the matter adequately and to have the opportunity to take action which would forestall the increase. But as to the amendment, the Department has agreed only to a postponement of about 6 weeks from this date.

All the amendment would do would be to set a date and provide that while the hearings were being held and the proposed legislation was being considered by the committee headed by the Senator from Louisiana, the increase in rates would not be put into effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for a bill embodying the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma to be considered and passed within 6 weeks' time?

Mr. KERR. I have grave doubt that such action could be obtained in 6 weeks' time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can give assurance that it should be possible for the Agriculture Committee to report a bill within the next 2 weeks, and I feel confident the House committee could do likewise.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Louisiana object to the consideration of my amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of objecting; the amendment is not germane to the issues covered by the pending bill. I fear the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma might complicate matters on the final passage of the bill; the farm problem is urgent and our farmers need immediate relief.

The Agriculture Committee does not have much information about what the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to do. The committee does not know all the issues involved. The committee has not had any hearings on the Senator's proposal. I feel it would be best to let the Senate consider the matter in the form of separate legislation on which hearings had been held.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, do I understand the Chair has ruled that the amendment is not germane?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, upon the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that if the matter shall be introduced as a bill, its consideration will be expedited in his committee, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there are several Senators who are vitally interested, not only in the passage of the bill as such, but especially in a section of the bill, namely, section 307, which deals with maritime matters and would effect the virtual repeal of a maritime law which requires, on government-financed cargoes, that at least 50 percent

of the cargoes shall be shipped in American bottoms.

This section, as I understand, was placed in the bill without hearings having been held on it. It is a maritime matter. The section would exempt from the application of Public Law 664, 83d Congress, 2d session, shipments of agricultural products financed by the taxpayers and thus would vitally affect the American merchant marine. It may have some importance in the bill, but is of minor importance to agriculture compared to the importance it bears to the entire American merchant marine.

Much has been said about germaneness. This is a subject which affects the entire American merchant marine. Hearings should be held upon it. It is true that a similar provision was included on the floor in foreign aid bills on several occasions, but hearings had been held on the 50–50 provision when it was made permanent. I have appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations on many occasions in connection with this matter.

I do not think the provision belongs in the farm bill. It is a matter which is very important to the American merchant marine and to those of us who have a deep interest in the maintenance of the American flag on the seas. We are having enough trouble keeping our flag on the seas now.

Many Senators will want to talk at some length on this subject. I know I would. I would not want to be limited by such a restriction as the proposed unanimous-consent agreement sets forth. I had hoped we might come to some agreement on the matter, because I too am interested in the agricultural bill; but an amendment which I would propose would permit the question involved in section 307 to be considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which rightfully should consider it. That committee would hold hearings and let all who are interested appear before the committee, so that opportunity would be afforded again to determine and reevaluate the importance of the matter to the American merchant marine and also to ascertain whether it affects the agricultural problem at all.

I assure the Senate—and I have discussed the matter with other members of the committee—that hearings would be held very promptly. A bill dealing especially with maritime problems could then be reported to the Senate. Some modifications of the present law might be needed.

I am very familiar with the subject. Approximately 80 percent of American exports today are carried in ships flying foreign flags. We are dealing here with less than 20 percent of our cargoes, only that portion of them, which are Government-financed.

This is the least we can do for our merchant marine. Two nations in Europe in particular are maritime countries. That is fine. I do not blame them for seeking our commerce, but they have been using the 50–50 law as a lever to promote their own interests.

This cargo preference provision is not mandatory; it is flexible. No one has said it should be enforced on a ship-by-ship or month-by-month basis. We have merely said that every opportunity should be afforded to achieve the 50–50 balance; otherwise the American flag will disappear from the seas. Today we are doing relatively little to keep our merchant marine alive. It is necessary for the Government to subsidize it. The more cargo that is taken away, the more it will be necessary for the Government to subsidize to keep our merchant marine from disaster.

During World War II, the American merchant marine hauled overseas 95.6 percent of all military cargoes. The merchant marine is actually our fourth arm of defense. It is just as important as any other service. But to include section 307 in the bill would be to cripple our merchant marine while we were engaged in an honest effort to solve our agricultural problem. I think the hearings will show that this provision will not help the agricultural problem. But all we seek is an opportunity to consider the question again. Perhaps it would be desirable to modify the provision to some extent.

In my State, the British saw fit to apply the law to reefer ships and to perishable commodities. Some fruit is exported from our State. The American merchant marine does not have reefer ships which call at Pacific coast ports. The law should not have applied at all. Perhaps it should be amended to take care of perishables, or to provide that in the case of strategic materials from all over the world inbound cargoes shall be hauled, in some fixed proportion, in American bottoms. But those are questions which should be explored by those who have experience in merchant-marine matters. Of course, we are interested in agricultural problems, but no hearings were held on this phase of the bill. The provision was inserted in the bill toward the end of its consideration, when the bill was being marked up. I think it is a subject which should be examined.

I am sure many Senators—I personally know of 15 or 20 Senators—would want to know something about what would happen if section 307 should be kept in the bill.

So, unless we can agree on this matter in some respect, I am sure I shall have to object to the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not conferred with other Senators as to how much time they may want, but after I do, perhaps the proposed unanimous-consent agreement can be modified. We think section 307 is a very, very important provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind my distinguished and beloved friend from Washington that it is proposed to provide 4 hours' debate on the bill. All of those 4 hours could be yielded. Usually, as the Senator knows, time is yielded back. All of the time could be yielded on any amendment at any time.

So far as the majority leader is concerned, I would be glad to bear in mind the Senator's need for extra time, and to agree here and now to yield him a portion of the 2 hours the majority leader would control under the unanimous-consent agreement, for use on an amendment. In addition to that, I know the Senator is very reasonable and fair, and I know he has not had time to confer with respect to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We did not know this provision was in the bill until the last minute, or we would have appeared before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not blaming the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Texas is perfectly willing, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Washington, to provide 3 hours on this particular amendment—if our colleague, the Senator from California, would go along with the suggestion—in addition to yielding a portion of the 4 hours on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If this provision is kept in the bill, I shall speak at some length on the subject. I shall review the history of the merchant marine, because the provision would be a great blow to the American merchant marine. I should like to help in dealing with the agricultural problem, but I think we can do it in a different way. All that is necessary is to agree to let the matter be considered. We would bring back a bill on the subject after hearings. Perhaps there is a need to modify the law.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desired to ask the Senator from Washington if he remembered that some time last July, the 1st or 2d day following the illness of the able majority leader, a bill affecting the merchant marine was before the Senate. I wanted to offer an amendment to strike out the cargo preference provision. Everyone was advising me not to offer such an amendment from the floor. Although considerable embarrassment was caused to those who felt the amendment should be presented, it was not offered because it was felt agriculture ought to have a chance. Nothing happened. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] joined in a bill which would do what was contemplated by the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If section 307 is deleted from the bill, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can take up the subject and hold hearings on that bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nothing was said until the provision went into the agricultural bill, and it went into the bill by unanimous agreement of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is a limit as to how far we can go to help the American merchant marine. I think it is right to help it. I have voted to help it time after time, but when it gets to the point where assisting it cripples the agricultural program, that is going too far.

As I recall, restriction contained in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act went into the act by a floor amendment. The Senator from Washington proposed a floor amend-

ment without any hearings being held. We propose the same thing, in return. What is wrong with that? The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is wrong. We did not get a chance to protest an amendment that was proposed from the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is true that in the first aid measure amendments were proposed from the floor, because of the plight of the American merchant marine. I had appeared before the committee. Senator Tom Connally said, "We will let you offer the amendment on the floor and we will accept it." Amendments were usually accepted by him when he was chairman of the committee, when the early bills on the subject were considered. Amendments were added to the foreign aid bill in that manner. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] later introduced a bill to make the law permanent. We had long hearings. The proposal was approved unanimously by our committee, and the law was made permanent.

Section 307 of the pending bill would virtually repeal the permanent law. It does not repeal the riders put into the law by amendments from the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would look at the provision. I do not think it repeals the permanent law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. It repeals it as to certain agricultural commodities, and they are very limited.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. However, it is directed to the permanent law, which was enacted after hearings. We think that if a permanent law is to be modified or changed, after long hearings had preceded its enactment, we ought to have a chance to have hearings to look into the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Washington that if he could see his way clear to accept the proposal presented by the Senator from Texas, it could be that there would not be as much opposition as the Senator might think to striking out the section and holding hearings. But I do not believe a unanimous-consent agreement should be held up on that basis alone. I think we should go along and trust our majority and minority leaders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to make my position clear. I am just as much interested in agriculture as is any other Senator, but many Senators are also interested in the American merchant marine. I do not want to hold up anything. I ask the simple justice of having hearings on so important a matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator's point of view that this particular section should not be in the bill without hearings having been held, but I hope the Senator will not object to the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed. As the Senator knows, if he felt himself pressed for time and found he could not complete his remarks, he would have an opportunity, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to offer an additional amendment to take care of any time he needed. I do not think the matter will require as much discussion as perhaps the Senator is fearful it will take.

If the Senator would be happier to have 3 hours instead of 2 hours provided on this particular amendment, perhaps that could be done, although I should dislike to see us begin to modify the proposed agreement by excepting various amendments. We are in a position where obviously the Senator is entirely within his rights in making his objection.

I believe the Senator, who has excellent knowledge of the subject, could present his facts and be more successful in making friends for his proposal within a 2-hour period, with such time adjustments as could be made, than he could as a result of a prolonged discussion. I say that as one who happens to believe this particular section should not go in the bill without adequate hearings being held before the proper committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not alone in the view I take. I speak for myself and other Senators who are not now present on the floor, but who happen to think this is a vital matter. I refer to the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Florida, the Senator from California, and other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is that on numerous occasions the 50 percent proposal has gone into the law by a very substantial majority.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know how long other Senators interested in the matter would wish to speak. So far as I am concerned, I think I could present my statement in a couple of hours, because when the Senate is informed, I believe it will see what a serious effect section 307 would have on the American merchant marine. It may be the hearings will show that this section will help agriculture. But when we weigh the two in the balance, I do not think any fair-minded person would favor such treatment of our merchant marine.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I may also point out that the proposed limitation of debate will not begin to run until next Wednesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Therefore, the able Senator from Washington and other Senators to whom he has referred will have ample time between tomorrow and next Wednesday to make adequately plain the great dangers, as he and other Senators may see them, in connection with having a provision of this kind in the bill.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a statement of fact which I think possibly may change the situation. For myself, I feel that we should not now enter into an agreement to limit debate. This morning—and at the first opportunity, I may say—the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was accompanied by members of his staff. He testified in a very interesting and informative manner in respect to the problems of agriculture.

During the discussion there, I addressed several questions to the Secretary of Agriculture; and I asked him to prepare some amendments to this bill. One of the questions I addressed to him was based upon the fact that President Eisenhower, in his message on agriculture to the United States Congress, had specifically asked for repeal of the provision of Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress which confines the sale of surplus commodities to friendly countries.

Senators who may have had the opportunity of listening to Secretary Dulles when he participated in the Philadelphia Bulletin program of last Sunday afternoon, and who may since have had an opportunity to read his speech, may recall that he said that in Russia, behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Khrushchev had told the Soviet gathering of the other day that in Russia there is a shortage of foodstuffs and, I think, of fiber. The Secretary quoted at great length the language used by Mr. Khrushchev in referring to the shortage of food supplies in Russia. If the Secretary of State finds that to be a fact, and if the President of the United States found it wise to insert in his message to Congress a request for repeal of this section, which confines such trade to friendly countries, I think that is a matter which should be laid before the Senate of the United States.

Therefore, I requested Secretary Benson to have prepared an amendment which would prevent abuse of the sale of our surplus food commodities in Russia, although at the moment it is difficult for me to think of a method by which such sales could be made a matter of abuse. The President sent to the Senate a message regarding ways of building peace with atomic energy. I think there is no reason why the Senate should not now undertake to study any amendment which the Secretary of Agriculture might send here at my request.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add that the amendment was included in Senate bill 2949 when it was introduced approximately 6 weeks ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; the Secretary of Agriculture so stated.

Mr. AIKEN. It was a very short amendment, and was included in that bill. However, it was stricken out in the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that in its consideration of this matter, the Senate must remember that 18 years ago, when Adolf Hitler was preparing Germany for its aggressive operations, he laid down the doctrine that the German people had to choose between guns and butter; and he stressed the importance, for their purpose, of obtaining guns.

If the same doctrine is followed by the Soviet Union I think we must be careful to make sure that we are not furnishing the Russians with the butter while they are making the guns—that is to say, various types of armaments—for such a course would enable them to concentrate their efforts on preparations to destroy the free world, while we were busy supplying them and other countries with foodstuffs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I completely agree. Nevertheless, I think we should look into the matter, particularly since the amendment—which in my judgment should be offered—should contain a provision to make certain that there would not be a substitution of guns for butter, but, instead, that there would be a substitution of butter for guns.

But I must point out that it was revealed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McCLELLAN], in a speech which he made last week, that some of our allies are now shipping copper wire and other strategic materials to the Soviet Union, and are refusing to tell the United States what they are doing, basing their refusal on the ground that such disclosure would be against public interest, although the facts in regard to such shipments of strategic metals by Britain and perhaps other nations have been freely published in the trade papers of England, and thus we obtain our information circuitously, while the State Department, in a letter written by the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., has refused to supply the Senate committee with the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may be mistaken, but my understanding is, not that the State Department refused to furnish certain information to the committee, but that the matter at issue related to the working papers. I think there has been testimony as to the amount of copper wire so shipped. I can say to the Senator from Wyoming that it has not made sense to me to have copper wire, which could readily be changed into shell casings, going into the Soviet Union in the quantities in which it apparently has been going there, when our Government itself does not permit such shipments of copper to be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point now is simply that the question is of such momentous importance that we should look into it. The President recommended such a provision, and it was included in the bill the Department of Agriculture suggested. It has been stricken from the bill by the committee. So far as I know, there have been no minority views on the part of any member of the committee in regard to the provision; in other words, I know of no objection to it.

But now that the Secretary of State has said publicly, by referring to the quotation from Mr. Khrushchev, that behind the Iron Curtain there is a shortage of food, let us find out about it, and see whether there is a practicable method of using for peaceful purposes the bread and the beef and the butter which we can produce in such abundant quantities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If such commerce can be kept on a peaceful basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that the Russians are not going to use in heavy industries, for the making of guided missiles, guns, planes, tanks, and other armaments to be used to destroy the free world, the workers who, except for such shipments of food to Russia, would have to be used in the production of such food.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I completely agree.

The other question I asked the Secretary of Agriculture was this: Inasmuch as the President has expressed sympathy toward the family-sized farm, would the Secretary consider an amendment to the bill which would provide that the full 90-percent supports would be extended to the production from family-sized farms, farms operated by families, and that the flexible supports should be confined solely to corporate farms and farms of a thousand acres or more?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I offered such an amendment to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, graduating the supports from the small family type farm to the larger farms, providing that in the case of a commodity loan application involving not to exceed $1,000, 100 percent supports would be granted; and that in the case of the large operators, making applications for commodity loans of several thousand dollars, supports possibly not in excess of 70 percent of parity would be applied. In that manner we would make certain that the Treasury would not underwrite the operations of someone who found it desirable to employ his invested dollar in the production of agricultural commodities in competition with what are normally regarded as the small, family type farm.

If such an amendment were studied and considered, we might well preserve and protect the family type farm, and not make the Treasury the underwriter for the man who wishes to use his dollars in the development and production of an agricultural commodity of which we have a surplus, in direct competition with the small family type farm, operated by a family who are making farming an existence, a way of life. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was aware that the Senator had such an amendment.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be unwise to limit debate at this moment, while the Secretary of Agriculture, who said he would do certain things, is working upon the proposed amendments. I expect to receive some suggestions from the Department of Agriculture. I do not like to see debate shut off.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator realizes the reason why agricultural legislation should be enacted at the earliest possible moment; does he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. AIKEN. In order that farm people may begin to receive the increased benefits which would be derived from it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is very important.

Mr. AIKEN. If we delay, such benefits may be lost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand the request, it is that the limitation on debate begin next Wednesday.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All I am saying is that I do not wish to enter into such an agreement today. I wish to see the amendments from the Department of Agriculture before I agree to limit debate.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect to receive those amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I expect to receive them as soon as they can be prepared. I assure the Senator from Louisiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I will telephone the Secretary's office again this afternoon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to state to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that the committee gave a great deal of study to the proposal which he is now discussing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the committee voted it down. In fact, several such proposals were made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee may have been right.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we were. I can cite one reason why I think we were right——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may vote with the Senator. However, I have not seen the new proposals which the Secretary has promised to prepare for us. If he does not prepare them, that will be another matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the bill was reported to the Senate for consideration, I had a time-table in mind which contemplated completion of consideration of the bill this week. Now, because there is objection to limiting debate, we are being asked to postpone action until Wednesday of next week. That means it will be a week from tomorrow before we begin voting.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senate be in session tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator can raise the question tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. We made the request yesterday, in the hope that it could be agreed upon today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am only saying that I hope we will not limit debate until we find out the significance of what Khrushchev said, what Dulles said, and what the Secretary of Agriculture said, all of which are new developments since the committee held its meeting.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were not new developments. We passed on those issues in committee. They are not new.

They have already been presented to us and they were rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Khrushchev spoke only a few days ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about making food available to Russia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Secretary of State spoke only last Sunday. The Secretary of Agriculture spoke this morning before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking of making food available to Russia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the problem the Senator presents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know, but there may be some new aspects to the question since the Secretary of State made his suggestion.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator must realize that if Russia wishes to buy food, she can buy food today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us look into the question. Then we shall know whether we are to continue to hold back development of arms in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Wyoming has been digging up some red herrings. Russia can buy food today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am so far from the red-herring grounds that I would not know a red herring if I were to meet one. I will take the advice of the Senator from Vermont on red herring.

I am merely saying that I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement today.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made this morning, February 28, by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

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

Most people in the Nation are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Unfortunately, this is not so for all farmers and farm people. The President's Economic Report states: "The first and most pressing problem requiring the attention of the Congress is the continued decline of agricultural incomes." Since 1951, farm income has receded while new highs have been established in the nonfarm economy. For sound economic growth, the fruits of our amazing productivity must be widely shared. The President's program for agriculture, if adopted shortly, will substantially strengthen the opportunities for our farm people to share in the ever-rising standard of living which our national capabilities provide. It will help add new vigor to sound economic growth.

THE CURRENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Heavy supplies depress farm prices

The huge surplus and our high level of output levy a heavy and growing burden on our farm and ranch people. Our economists estimate that the huge surpluses reduced farm income in 1955 by the staggering sum of more than $2 billion. This is nearly 20 percent of net farm income.

Most of agriculture is staggering under the accumulation of the greatest surplus of farm commodities in the Nation's history. Further, the current level of production of some commodities is outrunning our markets at this time even at prices distinctly unsatisfactory to farmers. The factors which have contributed to this vast supply burden are well known: Wartime price support production patterns maintained too long for a peacetime economy; the explosive impact of rapid technological changes on farm production; and the rising agricultural output in other countries which has limited our outlets for commodities in greatest supply.

At the beginning of the current marketing year last July, CCC investment in farm commodities exceeded $7 billion—the equivalent of more than a fifth of total farm marketings in a year. On top of record stocks, carried over from previous years, farm output in 1955 reached a new high, some 3 percent larger than in 1954. Crop yields rose 9 percent from the previous record—a gain in 1 year equal to the total gain of the preceding 5 years. In addition, the hog and cattle cycles were concurrently reaching their peaks with record or near-record rates of slaughter. During the first half of 1955, prices received by farmers had been fairly stable. The average of all farm prices in June 1955 was at the same level as at the beginning of the year. But under the impact of record output, the price decline, which had been under way since 1951, was renewed. Between June and December, prices received by farmers moved down 8 percent on the average. The sharpest drop came in hogs.

In recent weeks, the downtrend in prices has been arrested. According to the Department's latest report on agricultural prices, prices received by farmers in mid-January averaged slightly higher than in December. The hog market, although still low, has made a considerable recovery, especially since mid-January.

High cost structure also contributes to lower farm income

The farmer, with declining prices for the products he sells, faces a high and unyielding cost structure. Prices paid by farmers in mid-January averaged almost as high as a year earlier while prices received were down 7 percent. Further, this apparent stability in farm costs is misleading. It balances out substantial declines in prices paid for feed and feeder livestock—in many instances purchases by one farmer from another—with widespread price increases for products purchased from industry, notably motor vehicles, farm machinery and building materials. Even for food, the persistent increases in marketing costs have kept farmers, as well as other consumers, from realizing much relief in their food bills despite declines in prices of farm products.

The net result of the tightened cost-price squeeze in agriculture was a drop of about 10 percent in farm operators' total net income in 1955. This is the aggregate for the Nation. In some regions, particularly the Northeast and the Pacific States, farm operators' net income was much the same in 1955 as in 1954. In large parts of the South, incomes were improved in 1955. The major impact of declining farm incomes came in the North Central and Mountain regions.

On a per capita basis, including the income of farm people from nonfarm sources as well as farm income, the decline from 1954 to 1955 was 6 percent. These reductions in incomes of farmers and farm people in the past year come on top of other reductions suffered in every year but one since 1947. That one year was 1951, at the height of the Korean war.

Agriculture is not prostrate and we should not forget that we have had large declines in the past. For example, in one year, 1949, per capita income of farm people dropped 20 percent. The total decline per capita since 1951 has been 12 percent. Further, despite this reduction, the average farm person in 1955 was about as well off in terms of purchasing power as in 1949. We can point to other indicators—the low rate of farm foreclosures in 1955, the strong farm financial position, the rising trend in land values to record highs—to show that there is a high degree of stability remaining in agriculture. But farm prices and farm incomes are too low, and we must see to it that significant improvement in the farmers' economic position is brought about promptly.

Wartime incentives were continued in peacetime with the apparent hope that they would protect farm incomes. Whatever the purpose, they have obviously failed. The decline in farm income from 1951 until the harvest of the 1955 crops occurred under the old law. In fact, realized net farm income has declined every year but one from 1947 to 1954, all under the old law. That one year was 1951, during the Korean war. Only during recent months has the Agricultural Act of 1954 begun to be operative.

Consumption increasing steadily, but stocks continue to rise

The present agricultural situation, while one of deep concern, has some favorable aspects. The broad base of consumption of farm products has expanded. Not only is our population increasing rapidly, but food consumption per person has also shown a significant increase since 1951. As a nation, we are consuming over 10 percent more food than at the time of the Korean war. This is real progress in developing peacetime uses for wartime production levels. Further, export volume of United States farm products, while still unsatisfactory in relation to our potential in world markets, has been improved materially in the last 3 years. The volume of agricultural exports dropped almost 30 percent from the fiscal year 1952 to the fiscal year 1953. Since then about half of the decline in export volume has been regained. In the current fiscal year, even with reduced demand from abroad for United States cotton, we expect an export volume in total about the same as last year.

To a substantial extent, these gains in expanding markets, particularly foreign markets, reflect vigorous programs of surplus disposal. In fiscal 1955 the CCC disposed of over $2 billion of price-support commodities compared with a half billion in fiscal 1953. In the current fiscal year, we expect to dispose of $2.5 billion of surplus commodities.

Despite aggressive surplus disposal and growing consumption of farm products, production of some crops has continued out of balance with peacetime needs. For each bushel equivalent sold out of CCC stocks, approximately one and a half have replaced it. The CCC investment in inventory and in price-support operations by the end of December has risen to $8.7 billion and it may well be that the statutory authority of $12 billion will need to be raised during the current session of Congress.

By the end of the current marketing year, carryover stocks of wheat are expected to exceed 1 billion bushels. While this is slightly less than at the beginning of the season, it is still more than enough to meet prospective requirements for our product in domestic and foreign markets for a full year. We expect that the cotton carryover at the end of this season will approximate 14 million bales, a new high and also more than enough for a full year's domestic and export requirements. The corn carryover will likely also exceed 1 billion bushels, and the carryover of other feed grains is expected to be a record high. Rice stocks are also at record high levels and increasing. Most of these stocks will be held by or under loan to the CCC. The exception to the rule

of mounting surpluses is that stocks of food fats and oils by next fall will be less than half those of 2 years previous, reflecting a better balance in butter production and increased disposition of other fats and oils in foreign markets.

The President's farm program

It is clear that the onrush of technology and the productive potential of our agricultural community have outrun the capacity of existing farm programs to decisively and realistically adjust production to present market potentials. Moreover, the surplus problem has been aggravated to the extent that it will remain a barrier to price and income improvement and the effective working of present programs until significant reductions are in view. The President's program amounts to a massive attack to attain the objectives of adjusting production so as to reduce as rapidly as possible the vast surpluses and to insure that such unwieldy stocks are not built up again in the future.

The soil bank

The heart of the President's program to adjust production and reduce stocks is the soil-bank proposal. The establishment of a soil bank would be in two parts. One part—the acreage reserve—is specifically directed at the surplus crops of wheat, cotton, corn, and rice. The target for this proposal is to bring about the reduction of excessive carryovers for these crops to normal levels in 3 or 4 years. Farmers would voluntarily reduce their averages of these crops below their allotments. They would place specific acres into the reserve, receiving in return as compensation certificates which would be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The total acreage involved in this proposal might be from 20 million to 25 million acres below 1956 allotments. For the next several years production would be reduced below consumption rates. Commodities now in Government hands could move to market. This is a temporary program to end as soon as surpluses are brought down to the size of normal carryover stocks.

This is a voluntary program. We have studies underway to determine the rate of compensation to farmers necessary to insure their participation in the acreage reserve. The payment will be generous enough to assure broad participation and effectiveness of the program.

The other phase of the soil bank is the conservation reserve. This is a long-range program. Also voluntary, it would be open to all farmers regardless of the crops they grow. The objective is to shift about 25 million acres from cropland to forage, trees, or water storage. It is designed to take some of our less productive lands out of current use and to improve them for long-range needs. In addition, some of the acres which have been diverted out of wheat and cotton into feed grains would be affected. Thus we will be moving in on the surplus problem of feed grains caused by the acreages diverted from other surplus crops. For this part of the program the Goverment would bear a fair share of the cost involved in establishing suitable cover, up to a maximum amount, that would vary by regions. Further, as the farmer reorganizes his farm along these soil conserving lines, the Government would provide certain annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish a new use of the land.

Let me point out that both the acreage reserve and conservation reserve have a strong feature of income insurance, since these payments would be made regardless of crop yields. Also historic acreage allotments would be protected.

Thus the soil-bank program could take out a total of 45 to 50 million acres of presently used cropland. There would be no grazing on the acreage reserve. Grazing would be prohibited on the conservation reserve for a specified period. We would be taking out as much as one-eighth of our total cropland from current use. We would expect a substantial reduction in crop output in 1956, especially output of surplus commodities, if the tools this program provides are available soon.

Let me discuss for a moment the 1957 budget expenditure estimates included in the President's budget message. You will note that the total budget expenditures for agriculture in fiscal 1957 are estimated at about the same level as in fiscal 1956 despite the inclusion of $400 million to be expended for the conservation reserve of the soil bank. You will also note that the principal offsetting factor is the reduced estimate of expenditures under price-support programs. While the CCC budget estimates were formulated before the soil bank proposals were made by the President, it may be said that they include sufficient to cover the cash outlays under the acreage reserve program. This is based on the assumption that acreage reserve payments will amount to somewhat less than the amount of price-support loans that otherwise would have to be made on production from these same acres. I should mention that the estimate of the cost of price-support programs can be only a rough approximation at this time depending on the yields and market conditions that are realized during fiscal 1957. Under conditions of further acreage restrictions and the possibility that yields this year will not be as high as the very high yields of 1955, a substantial reduction in price-support expenditures would have been anticipated in any event.

This program is designed to increase farmers' net income in 1956 both directly in terms of payments to farmers from the Government and indirectly through the easing of supply pressures on prices.

Other parts of the program

The President's program consists of 9 points. I have discussed the soil bank which is perhaps the most vital of all. I will mention the others briefly.

The President has proposed measures which will widen and improve surplus disposal, particularly barter opportunities and removal of restrictions on surplus movements to the Communist bloc. This will help move CCC stocks out of the front door while the soil bank reduces what comes in the back door.

Commodity programs will be strengthened to improve price-support operations for individual products, including, among other actions, higher price supports for 1956 crop soybeans, cottonseed, and flaxseed, and an expanded school-milk program.

The President proposed that, if the Congress sees fit to enact it, a dollar limit on price supports should be established which will enable our family farms better to compete with huge corporation-type units.

The rural-development program already underway should be enlarged. It will open wider the doors of opportunity for both farm and nonfarm activities, especially for a million and one-half farm families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year. In brief, this program, which is cooperative with other Federal agencies and many of the States, involves research, education, credit, technical assistance, employment information, and vocational training.

The Great Plains program will help promote a more stable agriculture in an area where the risks of farming are great.

The President proposed increases in research which will help us find new crops, new market, and new uses for our agricultural abundance. A strengthened program of research and education will insure continued healthy progress in our agriculture and result in new horizons for our future.

Credit facilities will be expanded and strengthened to aid in the period of adjustment.

The gasoline tax, now paid by farmers to the Federal Government, would be refunded for purchases of gasoline used on farms.

This program, therefore, is many sided. It attacks not only the supply side of the farm problem but also expands market outlets and eases the cost-price burden in agriculture.

It is obvious that this cost-price squeeze will continue until and unless we can dispose of the surpluses which smother farm prices. But how dispose of them?

Number one way is to sell them at home—move the produce somehow into the domestic market in competition with current production. We know what this would do to farm prices.

The number two way of getting rid of surpluses is to sell them abroad. That can be done to a certain extent, and we have been doing it. But to force our surpluses on markets abroad in excessive quantities brings justifiable objections from our allies overseas. To upset world markets and depress world prices stimulates restrictive laws and retaliatory measures against us that hurt American farmers.

Number three way to get rid of our surpluses is deliberately to destroy them. This cannot be tolerated; the public will not approve such waste.

There is one other way, the only sound way yet devised, to get out from under the surplus burden and that is to cut down the flow of wheat, corn, and cotton into Government hands. This must be done—soon.

What the President proposed is a direct and effective attack on the surpluses themselves, an all-out operation which we should not ask the Nation to undertake more than once. In this respect it is not a new farm program; it is a means of clearing away the debris of our past programs so that our present program can go forward. This is not a program to empty warehouses so they might be filled again.

The Senate is now debating S. 3183. This bill would in general implement the administration's soil bank proposals. It would, however, also provide for a return to high rigid price supports for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity, which the administration opposes for many important reasons. Mandatory 90 percent of parity—

Piles up surpluses, which then depress farm prices and farm incomes.

Fails to protect 75 percent of our farm production.

Stimulates unneeded output.

Retards wise farm management.

Discourages sound soil conserving practices.

Results in strict production controls.

Shifts problems to other commodities through the diverted acres route.

Distorts price relationships among farm products.

Throttles consumption.

Disturbs foreign trade.

Causes government to replace the private trade in the marketing of farm products.

Increases the cost of farm programs.

Gives least help to the small operators, who need help most.

Ignores the fact that volume is important, along with price.

If 90 percent of parity were the answer to our farm problems we would have no farm problems. Rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity have been in effect on every basic commodity from the year 1947—which was the high benchmark of farm income—until this fall's harvest. Except for the last few months, the declines in farm prices and farm income have taken place while 90 percent of parity was in effect.

With the soil bank, S. 3183 would strive to reduce our surplus. With rigid price

supports at 90 percent of parity, the bill would provide the incentive for increased production and growing surplus. Both programs are costly and, so far as the effect on surplus is concerned, directly opposed to one another. It is time to decide whether we wish to move toward still greater surplus or toward a better balance of supplies and markets. This is the real issue as the Senate debates this bill.

S. 3183 would return us to the use for four commodities, of old or new parity, whichever is higher. This feature cannot be supported on a basis of equity or economics. Of the 159 farm products on which parity prices are computed, 4 would get this special treatment. These 4 are wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. In terms of up-to-date supply and demand conditions (that is, modernized parity) the support levels provided by S. 3183 would be: peanuts, 107 percent; wheat, 103 percent; corn, 100 percent; cotton, 91 percent.

Other features of S. 3183 are objectionable, and should be deleted. One is a provision which would increase the level of price supports for dairy products. The dairy business is making a commendable recovery from the dark days of 1954, when huge stocks of butter filled Government warehouses. Consumption is up, Government stocks are down, and the dairy industry has launched an effective sales and promotion program. To require an increase in the level of price support would return the dairy industry to the very difficulties from which it is now escaping.

There is an opportunity to get constructive legislation for agriculture, this year, if a number of the more objectionable features of S. 3183 can be deleted. Luckily this bill is so drawn that the needful amputations can be achieved without impairing the constructive parts of the bill. The big task, of course, is to persuade the patient to undergo surgery.

How much the administration's proposals will affect farm income in 1956 is hard to judge. We have reaped the consequences of years of unfortunate policies in agriculture. We cannot correct the situation overnight. We should keep firmly in mind that this program is not a temporary alleviation of the distress in agriculture. It corrects the basic ills, and its benefits are cumulative. The program provides a long-range solution to one of the most pressing problems our economy faces.

Let us realize also that in developing a solution for the economic forces that beset the farmer in the market place, our efforts on behalf of the low-income farmer who produces little for these markets should not lag behind. If we are to solve the whole agricultural problem, we must also proceed vigorously in the President's program to help the low-income farmer who has been so long disadvantaged in participating in the Nation's progress.

It is no less important, in this period of adjustment in agriculture, that we do what we can to ease the burden of high costs in agriculture. Rigidities in the price structure of the nonfarm economy have increased the cost of items which the farmer must purchase and reduced the share he receives of the consumer's food dollar. In a period of declining farm prices, I cannot be sympathetic with increases in prices of items such as steel and of farm machinery which have occurred in recent months. Nor can I view with detachment the current request of the railroads for a further increase in freight rates which will aggravate the cost-price squeeze. The economic forces and policies that are contributing to a higher cost structure in agriculture, and in the economy at large, are not only a distinct threat to the well-being of agriculture, but perhaps also to the stability of the economy as a whole.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have just been attending hearings before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I listened to the statement of Secretary Benson on the currently proposed agricultural legislation. I find this testimony of the Secretary to be so factual, so clear, and so rational, that I believe it should be made available to the entire membership of the Senate as a part of the discussion now in progress with regard to the agricultural bill. So I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has had it printed in the body of the RECORD. Had he not done so, I would have made the request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad there is to be printed in the RECORD at this point the statement made earlier today by Secretary of Agriculture Benson before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I would have offered it for printing in the RECORD at this point if it had not been previously submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and again referred to by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, earlier I reserved the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, and then yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who made the objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] objects.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very sorry, indeed, that it was not possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to begin voting on the farm bill. With respect to the item which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other Senators discussed a few moments ago, I should like to say that section 307 in the bill merely provides that the cargo preference acts shall not apply to transactions under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

I merely wish to point out that title I refers to sales for foreign currency. We are providing in the bill that sales can be made to foreign governments, which they will pay for with their own currency, but we then tell them that they must ship the goods in American bottoms.

Mr. President, that has been the cause of annoyance. It does not necessarily cause any great financial loss to the foreign countries to make them comply with such a provision, but people just do not like to be told that when they buy something with their own money they must comply with our directions as to how they shall transport the goods to their countries.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, by unanimous vote, thought that such a provision was not proper. It thought the provision was impeding the agricultural development of this country, and particularly that it was doing a great deal of damage to the agricultural commodities produced in the area from which the Senator from Washington comes and which he well knows.

If there is objection to section 307 of the pending bill today I merely say that the bill has been on the floor for a long time, and that it was reported to the Senate after a marathon session which lasted 14 hours of almost continuous meeting by members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. To say now that such a provision should be taken back to committee and reconsidered seems pretty hard to some of us.

I merely wish to point out that if we do not begin voting on the bill soon we will succeed in making its provisions inapplicable to 1956. That can readily happen, because in a very short time the farmers will start planting crops in many parts of the country.

While I do not like the provisions which the able majority leader and the able minority leader have agreed upon, I say very frankly that I am willing to forget that and am willing to go on and debate the bill under the limitations proposed.

There was a reference in the first proposal to substituting House bill 12 for the Senate bill. I do not like House bill 12 at all. It merely provides for 90 percent price supports, and my position on that provision is well known. However, the leaders on both sides have agreed on something which they believe is sensible, and I am certainly not going to object to that sort of program.

I express the hope that an agreement to vote will finally be reached, so that we can start to vote on the bill at an early date. After the farm bill is passed by the Senate, if it is finally passed, it must go to conference. A great many Senators, I am sure, remember how tough some of the conferences between the Senate and the House have been on agricultural bills.

I sat in the conference on the farm bill of 1949 almost by special courtesy, because my name had been attached to the Senate bill. I did not have sufficient seniority on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to be there, yet the members of the committee were gracious enough to permit me to be present. We remained deadlocked for days. Finally, it became quite apparent that we were not going to reach any agreement, and I made a motion that the conferees break up in disagreement and report disagreement to the Senate and to the House. That motion carried. The action subsequently was reversed—I never knew exactly how—and we took another vote the next day, when we were not so tired, and did submit a conference report. But we were literally days and days in steady session. On this occasion, we are going to have pretty much the same problems between the Senate and the House.

The House, in 1949, passed a 90 percent price-support bill, and the Senate passed a flexible price-support bill with the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on it.

In 1949 we had the same story. The so-called Brannan plan was reported by the Committee on Agriculture to the

House of Representatives. A then Representative, now a Member of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), strongly opposed it as it was reported from the Committee and moved as a substitute for the Committee bill that 90 percent price supports on basics be continued for the year 1950. His motion prevailed and the Gore substitute passed the House, but the Senate passed the flexible price support bill to which my name was attached. Again we spent many days in conference.

We may again find ourselves in the same sort of a wrangle. The House may pass the 90 percent bill. I trust the House will pass something different than that, but a conference agreement will not be quickly reached.

The House has now passed a 90 percent support bill. I trust the Senate will pass something different from that.

Some day I hope the farmers of the United States can have legislation passed before half of the planting season is over.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, whenever the majority leader and the minority leader can find some basis of agreement, I think we should start to vote, because I shall take whatever they present.

SHIPMENT OF COPPER AND OTHER STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO RUSSIA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, shipments of copper were mentioned on the floor this morning. In view of the fact that also this morning there was reported in the press an interview with Sir Roger Makins, British Ambassador to the United States, who appeared as a guest on Reporter's Roundup yesterday, February 27, regarding United Kingdom shipments of copper to the Soviet Union, I wish to submit a few observations.

Sir Roger Makins was asked some questions regarding the study the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am a member, is now making of East-West trade. I believe there are going to be some misunderstandings coming out of Sir Roger Makins' interview which I thought it would be well to try to clarify as soon as possible.

There was some controversy in this broadcast with respect to copper.

Mr. President, there was testimony before our subcommittee that more than 250 million pounds of copper products have been sent to the Soviet Union since copper was removed from the embargo list in August 1954. Over 75 million pounds of this was sent from the United Kingdom and it is my understanding that licenses have been received for the sale of many more millions of pounds of copper wire during 1956. Perhaps Sir Roger Makins would inform us as to the number of licenses that have been granted by the United Kingdom for the shipment of copper wire during this year.

I might say here, Mr. President, that as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee, reported in a speech to the Senate last Thursday, Congress was officially informed on December 23, that copper remained under embargo. The Senator from Arkansas stated, "this was a gross misstatement of a material fact. It served to mislead Congress and the people."

Sir Roger Makins was questioned about the horizontal boring machine and its strategic value, and whether any of these types of machines have been sent to the Soviet bloc by Great Britain. The Ambassador stated he did not know about such a machine.

In view of this I thought it would be helpful to place some facts in the RECORD.

First, the horizontal boring machine in question costs between $200,000 and $500,000. Second, it was testified before our subcommittee by Defense Department experts, that this machine is indispensable in the manufacture of tanks, heavy artillery weapons, aircraft, ship transmission parts, and catapult parts on aircraft carriers.

These huge machines take approximately 18 months to manufacture. Sir Roger Makins said he did not know of any of these machines being sent to the Soviet bloc. But the record shows one and possibly 2 of these machines have been sent, and that 4 more are to be sent by a British manufacturer.

It might be well, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD some figures on the United Kingdom's exports to the Soviet bloc since the relaxation of controls in August 1954. In 1953 the United Kingdom exported $92.7 millions worth of goods to the Soviet bloc, of which $34.3 millions was to the Soviet Union itself. In 1955, 6 months after trade restrictions had been relaxed with the concurrence of this Government, the United Kingdom exported $164.4 millions worth to the Soviet bloc of which $89.4 million was to Russia.

During that period of time, Mr. President, there was an increase of about 80 percent in the United Kingdom exports to the Soviet bloc and almost 150 percent increase in Great Britain's exports to the Soviet Union itself.

Mr. President, although the complete statistics are not available for 1955 as to the type of goods sent by the Soviet Union to Great Britain, there are some statistics available for the first 6 months of that year. The Soviet bloc furnished to Great Britain in return for these machine tools, machinery, metals, and transportation equipment, $20 million of wood and wood pulp, $13 million of cotton, $13 million of meat, $10 million of coal, $7½ million of fur skins, $4½ million of eggs, $4 million of pig iron, $3 million of corn, $3 million of fruits and vegetables, $2½ million of manganese, and $2 million of feeding stuffs, and so forth.

Mr. President, there was also another exchange with Sir Roger Makins on Reporter's Roundup regarding the United Kingdom's shipments of rubber to the Soviet bloc which I think should be clarified. So that there can be no dispute about it, I should like to read the questions and answers.

WILSON. Well, Bob, I, as a good Middle Western American, can't let the opportunity pass wholly to Miss Montgomery to twist the lion's tail as we call it. So, may I ask you, Mr. Ambassador, is there being shipped behind the Red Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain any rubber which is within the control of Her Majesty's Government?

MAKINS. Not from the—not from United Kingdom sources. Or colonial—or British colonial territories—that is prohibited. It is being shipped from other countries.

WILSON. But not within the orbit of Government of the United Kingdom?

MAKINS. No.

WILSON. But from somewhere in the south of—southeast Pacific probably. Is that right? Southwest?

MAKINS. Well, there are countries that are shipping, that are sending rubber to China because they have very strong, in fact, invincible, almost economic arguments for doing so.

In order to clarify the record, Mr. President, let me say that in 1955 the United Kingdom shipped 25,371 tons of rubber and rubber products to the Soviet Union. Compare this to 1954 when there were 429 tons exported by the United Kingdom to the Soviet Union. We all are well aware of the strategic value of natural rubber.

What worries us on the committee is that all this information is kept from the American people.

The executive branch classifies this information in this country; but it is a matter of public record abroad.

I submit all this information in order to clarify the record.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). In accordance with the last resolving clause of Senate Resolution 221, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late senior Senator from West Virginia, the Senate will now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 221, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from the class of career minister to the class of career Ambassador:

James Clement Dunn, of New York.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.
H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Don C. Bliss, of New Jersey.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia.
Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire.
James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas.
William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert G. Miner, of New York.
Barr V. Washburn, of Utah.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Bray, Jr., of Missouri.
Harry H. Schwartz, of Ohio.

Paul C. Hutton, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Benjamin Bock, of Texas.
Frank M. Bryan, of Washington.
John Pryor Furman, of Virginia.
George O. Gray, of New Mexico.
George R. Jacobs, of Illinois.
Edward R. Kelley, of New York.
Robert Klaber, of Maryland.
Guy A. Lee, of Indiana.
Donald H. Nichols, of New Mexico.
R. Douglas Smith, of Virginia.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph A. Angotti, of West Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth R. Balmer, of Massachusetts.
Clifford O. Barker, of Virginia.
Raymond E. Chapman, of Michigan.
Frank A. Ecker, of Maryland.
John L. Hagan, of Virginia.
Earl T. Hart, of North Carolina.
Mrs. Mary S. Johnston, of Massachusetts.
Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
Charles J. Kolinski, of Wisconsin.
Miss Lillie Levine, of Iowa.
Floyd W. McCoy, of Ohio.
Vernon L. Merrill, of West Virginia
Walter L. Nelson, of Wisconsin.
Douglas B. O'Connell, of New York.
W. Angie Smith III, of Texas.
Eldridge A. Snight, of Virginia.
Richard Straus, of Maryland.
Casimir L. Sutula, of Connecticut.
Mrs. Kathleen Clifton Taylor, of Washington.
Karl F. Weygand, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Raymond Bastianello, of Texas.
Miss Virginia Whitfield Collins, of Florida.
William J. Drew, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Hodgson, of Michigan.
William C. Kinsey, of Virginia.
Waldemar A. Olson, of Wisconsin.
Joel Orlen, of Massachusetts.
Muneo Sakaue, of California.
Peter Simon, of New York.
Thomas E. Tait, of New Jersey.
Miss Marion M. Whinery, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul J. Aylward, Jr., of Kansas.
Curtis B. Brooks, of Vermont.
Don T. Christensen, of California.
Robert S. Dillon, of Virginia.
Guido C. Fenzi, of California.
Myles L. Greene, of Florida.
Harry W. Jacobs, of Kentucky.
James A. Klemstine, of Pennsylvania.
Albert A. Lakeland, Jr., of New York.
Jay R. Nussbaum, of New York.
Gerald A. Pinsky, of New York.
Miss Mary A. Roughan, of New Jersey.
Edward H. Springer, of Oregon.
Richard L. Springer, of Ohio.
Charles R. Stout, of California.
Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
Frank M. Tucker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Frontis B. Wiggins, Jr., of Georgia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Eugene D. Sawyer, of New York.
Edmund R. Murphy, of Maryland, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.
Harold G. Williams, of Washington, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dean J. Almy, Jr., of Maryland.
Thomas R. Craig, Jr., of West Virginia.
Wesley L. Laybourne, of Virginia.
Frederick U. Wells, of Maryland.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1956, vice Martin Kelso Elliott, resigned.

Donald P. McPherson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962, vice John Monroe Johnson, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. R. Donald Williamson, First Baptist Church, Tully, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, we pause humbly before Thee.

In a world seeking brotherhood Thou art the father of all mankind.

In a world weak through its own sins Thou art a God of power.

In a world where despair rules in the hearts of men Thou art a God of hope.

In a world where the hearts of men are gripped by the fear of war Thou art a God of peace.

Look down upon us this morning and bring to us the spirit of brotherhood. Where there is weakness, bring us strength. Where there is despair, bring us hope and bring to the peoples of the world the peace of God that passeth all understanding through Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

IMPORT TAX ON NATURAL GAS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which has as its purpose the imposition of an import excise tax of 10 cents per thousand cubic feet on all natural gas imported into the United States. The object of my bill is to afford much needed protection to American interests as they may be affected by the many proposals to import natural gas from Canada and Mexico. I am advised that the Federal Power Commission is currently considering a number of applications seeking authority to import gas from Canada to serve communities adjacent to the northern borders of the United States and that an application is pending which proposes to serve the midwestern and eastern parts of the United States with Mexican natural gas.

There may be some who will contend that an import excise tax upon natural gas is in violation of the spirit of free trade between the United States and Canada and Mexico. However, I wish to point out that there is at present in effect in Canada an import excise tax upon American natural gas crossing the borders into our good neighbor country. Since I represent a State which is noted for its production of bituminous coal, it seems appropriate also to point out that the Canadians tax all American coal coming into Canada at the rate of 50 cents per ton. The Canadians cannot, therefore, seriously object to the imposition of an import tax on such natural gas as may be authorized to be brought into the United States.

It is necessary to preserve and protect our own fuel resource industries from damage and destruction which can result from the introduction of foreign natural gas into the United States. Such gas can be brought in on a basis that will cause economic dislocation, impair capital investments, and create needless unemployment unless some form of a balancing excise tax is applied to this foreign competition. It has not yet been determined the extent which the Canadian Government or the Canadian Provinces, or both, will finance and otherwise subsidize the proposed trans-Canada natural-gas pipeline. Present indications are that it cannot be built without substantial subsidy from the Canadian Government. Yet Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. and Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. are asking the United States Federal Power Commission to approve applications to bring natural gas into the United States and to service areas in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The point is that the FPC is being asked to approve the importation of natural gas without first knowing the extent to which American competing fuel industries will be asked to compete against a Canadian subsidized gas industry. Such subsidized competition would represent a disruptive and destructive force loosed upon

the competing American fuel industries—natural gas, oil, and bituminous coal.

It is only the exercise of commonsense to act now to protect our own best interests in this manner by writing into the law an import excise tax as I have proposed. I repeat, that we are only doing here that which has already been done by the Canadian Government since they have imposed a tax upon American natural gas and coal that crosses the Canadian border into Canada. I am introducing my bill today in the hope that the Congress will act favorably on it and recognize the need for such legislation in order to protect the best interests of the Nation in maintaining our self-sufficiency in the all-important field of energy production in the United States. I will give the Congress additional facts and figures at a later date to show that legislation of this character is necessary.

DISASTER INSURANCE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as many in the House know, the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], has been conducting hearings on proposals to establish a Government system of disaster insurance. On the Senate side as well, the Banking and Currency Committee has been taking expert testimony on the deficiencies in commercial insurance policies involving loss and damage by natural disasters such as hurricanes, tidal waves, floods, and tornadoes.

Last week in the district which I have the honor to represent, the 24th District of Illinois, the twisting winds of a tornado struck with devastating force. There was literally millions of dollars of damage.

Now it is possible to buy commercial insurance against some of the losses that may result from a tornado. But it is not possible for a citizen to cover himself with commercial insurance from all the losses that may result.

For example, if a person carries tornado insurance with a reliable commercial company, he will be reimbursed if a shingle is blown off the roof of his home or his barn or if the barn blows down. But he will not be reimbursed for damage to his crops. He will not be reimbursed for water damage arising from the flooded creeks and streams that frequently accompany tornadoes. The windstorm may pass him by and yet he may suffer great loss from the flood damage that occurs a little later—and for the loss occasioned by this flood damage he is completely unprotected. It is possible, I am told, for a farmer to buy crop insurance—at a very high rate—from Lloyds of London. But the rate is so high as to be prohibitive for ordinary people. American commercial companies simply do not offer, as a general thing, insurance against loss of crops due to tornadoes and their side effects, any more than they offer policies covering a farmer against such natural disasters as drought. The small businessman can buy a policy protecting him against windstorm damage to plate-glass windows and the merchandise he has stocked. But he cannot buy a commercial policy protecting him from flood damage attributable to the tornado or other windstorm.

It seems to me that the deficiency is exactly the kind of weakness in our commercial insurance system that can be met only by Government action.

The resources of the commercial companies are not adequate to meet the need. No one can accurately predict where a tornado or hurricane or flood will strike. It is popularly supposed, for example, that tornadoes usually occur in the Midwest and the South. Yet in June of 1953 a tornado of devastating force hit the city of Worcester, Mass. The hurricanes, tidal waves and floods resulting from hurricanes used to punish the State of Florida; in recent years they have been striking the Carolinas, Virginia, New England, and the reaches of Canada.

The Banking and Currency Committees acknowledges, I believe, that in setting up a system of Government-inspired insurance against the loss arising from natural disasters it is necessary to move with caution. No one knows exactly how to calculate the cost of the system. No one knows precisely what types of natural disaster should be included in the system when it is inaugurated. The Congress needs the advice and counsel of experts, even though the statistics available to these experts are not all inclusive.

Certain facts, however, are inescapable. First, as our population grows and as investment expands, the potential damage from natural disaster obviously increases. Second, there are great gaps in the system of commercial insurance now available. Third, certain types of loss—such as loss from damage to crops and loss resulting from floods and rising water are not now covered by American commercial companies and are not likely to be covered by private companies in the future. Fourth, the generosity of the American people and the emergency relief offered by such fine organizations as the Red Cross are no longer adequate to meet the serious economic needs.

It seems to me that the appropriate committees of this body and the Senate are exploring a field of great importance in holding hearings on measures to establish a Government system of natural-disaster insurance. I would urge them to consider earnestly the importance of action and the importance of including, if possible, insurance against loss from damage to growing crops as well as damage of other kinds from floods and tornado-caused ground water.

I am today introducing a bill to establish a Government system of insurance. Some 40 such measures already have been offered, and I am aware that the distinguished committee has already conducted some 3 weeks of hearings on the proposals. It is my earnest hope that the distinguished chairman [Mr. SPENCE] may feel that the time is ripe for resuming consideration of the proposals, if in his judgment that is wise, and that the committee may decide that it is possible to report a bill for consideration by the House itself. I have done all that I could to help set in motion the appropriate processes now available for help to the hard-hit citizens of the 2d District, but I am aware—as all of us are, I think—that what is now available is not sufficient to meet the need when an area and its people are struck by unforeseeable natural disaster. A carefully planned system of Government-encouraged or Government-guided insurance would come much closer to meeting the need.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House that again today we have had more railroad accidents. I am advised that in Swampscott, Mass., this morning there was a serious railroad accident causing the death of 16 persons and injuring hundreds of passengers. I am informed that a seven-car stainless steel train en route from Portsmouth, N. H., to Boston, Mass., plowed into the rear of a four-car Budd train that was stopped at the time during a heavy snowstorm. It is very apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, that these railroad accidents are becoming more and more frequent. We had our troubles sometime ago with the New Haven Railroad. And now these accidents are on the Boston and Maine Railroad. Last Friday night in the Cambridge-Boston district, a number were injured when an accident happened in that area. The reason given by them was that somebody had pulled the emergency stop signal. As a result of that accident, a number of people had to be sent to the Massachusetts General Hospital for immediate attention. Mr. Speaker, as one who rides frequently on the railroad, it is hard for me to believe that anybody would pull a stop emergency signal and cause such an accident. It is very apparent to me that many of these unfortunate accidents to these railroad riders come about as a result of the railroad curtailing on the help from time to time and also as a result of the fact that the equipment is not in proper condition. For that reason today, Mr. Speaker, I am filing a resolution which I am including as part of my remarks, and I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will investigate these accidents not alone in my own State of Massachusetts but in New England generally.

House Resolution 412

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the factors contributing to railroad accidents in the United

States, giving particular attention to the railroad accidents which have recently occurred in the New England area, for the purpose of determining the best available methods for preventing the occurrence of similar accidents in the future.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am today, like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], introducing a resolution providing that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Congress investigate the accidents which appear to be occurring almost weekly. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last 4 days there have been 4 accidents on the Boston & Maine Railroad which goes through my district as well as the district of my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. I do not believe that we can, at this particular stage, fix the blame, Mr. Speaker. There was a very bad snowstorm going on in Massachusetts when the accident occurred this morning, but I, like my colleague [Mr. LANE], have been deeply concerned over the lack of maintenance and equipment on some of these roads. Something must be done.

I called the White House a few moments ago and asked them down there to exercise all the authority at their disposal to take action in this regard so that we can prevent as far as humanly possible these recurring accidents.

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

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

Mr. HESELTON. I am a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I, too, hope that there will be a prompt investigation to establish the facts in regard to these very unfortunate accidents.

I hope also that the Interstate Commerce Commission on its own initiative will start an investigation to determine these facts as quickly as possible. Those who have served with the Boston & Maine Railroad and all the other great railroads are entitled to the full facts now.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

EMPLOYMENT IN SHIPYARDS AND NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the time is not far off when all ships, both naval and private, will be propelled by atomic power. The first surface ship, a light cruiser, is included in the fiscal 1957 construction program.

Obviously, it will be necessary to have trained personnel in all shipyards to install and service this new type of power. A knowledge of nuclear reactors is something that can be acquired only by advance study and training. In my own district in the State of Washington, I have been gratified to find that recently 4 workers were nominated for a 1-year course at the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology. Also, I am informed that certain other engineers will attend classes in the navy yard for the purpose of creating a nucleus of trained personnel to teach this important subject to other skilled workers and, finally, I was pleased to learn that the University of Washington will establish classes for those who desire study in this new field.

Because our first use of atomic propulsion will be in combat vessels, it does not follow that only the workers in public yards should have training available to them. I hope that Members of Congress who are on the appropriate committees will see to it that equal opportunity is afforded to the personnel of private shipyards for schooling in the adaptation of nuclear reactors for marine propulsion.

Along this line, I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that recently private industry hired away from the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard two men who are skilled in the atomic field. These men may still be available for Government work, but it would appear to me that Members of Congress should see to it that incentive in the way of pay and retirement in Government service is comparable to private industry so that we can retain engineers and skilled workers who are necessary to install and maintain the reactors for our Navy.

President Eisenhower has said the United States is making available for sale or lease 88,000 pounds of uranium 235—$1 billion worth—for power production, one-half in this country and one-half for foreign use, not including, of course, the Soviet bloc. We are truly waging peace by emphasizing and promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It would seem to me, however, that more know-how among American technicians and workers is needed. Are we going to have the skilled workers to install, maintain, and operate atomic powerplants and utilize this uranium 235?

Often one hears it said we have a cloak of unnecessary secrecy over much atomic information. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the workers of America are not being overlooked. Opportunities to progress are their right, just as it is the right of America to have a skilled work force trained to make the most of this atomic age. Know-how can be our greatest resource.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 408, Rept. No. 1823), 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. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

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. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 9]

Barden	Gamble	Mumma
Bell	Garmatz	Osmers
Bentley	Gavin	Poage
Boland	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bonner	Horan	Priest
Bowler	James	Prouty
Boykin	Jenkins	Rabaut
Carrigg	King, Pa.	Rains
Celler	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	McDowell	Tollefson
Denton	McIntire	Van Zandt
Eberharter	Macdonald	Watts
Edmondson	Merrow	Wharton
Fascell	Metcalf	Williams, Miss.
Fogarty	Mollohan	Zelenko
Fountain	Morgan	
Fulton	Morrison	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF PATENT RIGHTS TO CERTAIN WARTIME INVENTIONS

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 409, Rept. No. 1824), 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. 2128) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS

Mr. O'NEILL (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 410, Rept. No. 1825), 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. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order to not only enable the needs of America of today, and of 10 years or more, to be met, we must plan and build now.

As we view the world of today and look into the future, as far as we can with reasonable certainty, we see a nation in the next 12 years with a population of 200 millions of persons, and in a few generations, with a population in excess of 300 million. At the present time, the increase in our population is at the rate of about 3 million persons a year.

With this increased population will come increased demands for services and essentials of life and of industry and of national character. This will be particularly so in the field of water resources.

America is blessed with great natural resources, and among them are our great rivers, the resources of which are now, in the main, going to waste. If these resources are marshaled and utilized, and capable of the great use not only now but in the future, it will be for the best interests of our people and our country. In order to meet the demands that exist now, and which will rapidly increase, as we can foresee, we should act now to stop the wasting of our great resources. In doing this, we are building for the future.

In the pending bill, we are making an investment which in terms of money will be returned manifold, but greater, in terms of happiness, to countless of American families will be of inestimable value; and in terms of benefit to our country, will be unlimited.

We must bear in mind that our organic reclamation legislation goes back to 1902. For it was during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt that the National Reclamation Act of 1902 was enacted into law. It was nurtured under Theodore Roosevelt, and under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman it blossomed into nationwide action and benefits. And the projects built and completed during the past 50 years have been an investment beneficial not only to the area served, but to the country as a whole. For an important element in the growth of our country is reclamation and water-resources development.

In terms alone of conserving our water for personal use, our country now has a challenge in various sections; and in the near future, it will be a national challenge.

The mere fact that we live in a section of the country removed from the wide section that this great project will immediately serve, and because of geographical residence alone, as a result of which we have no immediate or special interest, is no reason why we should vote against this or any other worthwhile project. We should not view projects of this kind from a sectional angle. We should view them from a national angle and the national interests.

The Colorado River storage project, now before us, while somewhat different from the Senate bill, calls for an integrated system of dams and storage reservoirs to regulate and control the waters of the upper Colorado Basin covering major parts of four of our great States—Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. In this great area, water alone is of vital importance.

In the immediate intermountain region, the Colorado River with its tributaries constitutes the greatest source of water. From its source, the Colorado River and its tributaries flow into the Gulf of California. It is a great project for a great country, the authorization and completion of which will make a great contribution to the future growth and welfare of our country. Involved is not only the question of water for personal use, but also reclamation and power and other favorable results that will be of great benefit, not only in the area served, but nationwide. The completion of this project will, through its controlled features, preserve millions of acre-feet of water now permitted to escape in eroding fury during wet years. It will assure the lower basin States of a constant and dependable source of water for the indefinite future.

It is interesting to note that in connection with this project, that although large quantities of electric power will be generated if the dams are built, the power aspect is considered a byproduct of the dam's purpose.

In past years we have witnessed great fights in this body to have enacted into law and to make the necessary appropriations for the construction of great projects in different sections of the country. We know as we look back that each and everyone of them have contributed to the progress of America. This great project is another step, another contribution to the progress of our country.

After many years of legislative effort and struggle, this project is before the Congress in its final legislative stages. Without regard to what section of the country we live in, let us view this project with vision and with courage, recognizing its needs not only for the immediate future, but the great benefits that will come to our country in the decades that lie ahead.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and to vote for the substitute bill that will be offered by the committee and upon final passage to vote for

the bill, for authorizing projects of this kind today means a stronger America tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that before he left Washington I spoke with Speaker RAYBURN about this matter. He is away on a very unfortunate journey. We hope and pray, all of the Members, for the quick recovery of his loved one. Speaker RAYBURN told me that he strongly supports the passage of the substitute bill, as I do, which will be offered by the committee to the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have sought this time in order to say that I shall support this rule and shall support the bill, and I sincerely hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill will be passed. As I am quite sure at least most of you know a measure dealing with this problem has already passed the other body, and that by a substantial vote. I think it is fair to say that the measure as it passed the other body in many respects goes much farther than the bill that is presently before us.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been long under consideration. It has been the subject of great controversy. It has been debated in Congresses in the past. I am quite convinced that the time has come to resolve the matter and to go ahead with the enactment of this measure, which, I am sure, is in the national interest.

Now, as everyone knows, I come from the State of Indiana. My district is not in the area directly affected by this project, so I have no direct sectional interest in it. But, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me, I think this is one of those measures where we are called upon to look at the broad national interest and what is best for our country rather than in any sectional interest. And that is not to say that in the passage of this measure can I find anything of adverse effect to my particular section.

I have given the whole matter such study as I could. I have tried to become informed about it. I do not claim to be too well advised about all of the intricate details that are involved in the legislation. But, having weighed the matter as best I can and knowing also that there are many conflicting views—and certainly those in opposition have my utmost respect—I am convinced that this bill should be passed.

Let me say here that it is not my intention to inject at this point or at any point any politics in this measure, because there should be no politics in the consideration of such a measure as this, but there have been some charges at times that those of us who sit on our side of the aisle are unmindful of the necessities for programs of reclamation in various sections of the country. Now, I think the record clearly discloses that any such charge as that is far from the truth. I well recall that as the majority leader in the 80th Congress I did my part in the appropriation of funds for reclamation that I think exceeded in their total any such sums theretofore appropriated by any Congress. I well recall that in the 83d Congress, as the majority leader, I scheduled for action a project somewhat similar to this known as the Arkansas-Fryingpan project. I did what I could to bring that measure to successful passage, and in that effort I was supported by an overwhelming majority of the Members on our side. But, as you know, history has it that that measure was defeated. Also, in that 83d Congress, I was happy to do my part in scheduling for action and bringing to passage the Trinity River project. Of course, in this Congress we have already passed measures for the Washita and Ventura projects.

In order that the matter may be perfectly clear—and possibly I should address these remarks primarily to my colleagues on my side of the aisle—I well recall that back in 1950 we Republicans in the Congress undertook to draft a statement of principles and policies. It was my responsibility to take a primary part in that because I was chairman of the House committee of three on the drafting of that statement. The committee of three Republicans from the other body was headed by the late great Senator, Bob Taft. In that statement we said that we supported "continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation."

Then in the 1952 platform of our party, having to do with Public Works and Water Policy we said this:

> The Federal Government and State and local governments should continuously plan programs of economically justifiable public works. We favor continuous and comprehensive investigations of our water resources and orderly execution of programs approved by the Congress.

Then we come on down to the 1955 state of the Union message, and amplify it further, when President Eisenhower said this:

> The Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.

I am also permitted to say that in recent weeks and months the President has again stressed the sincere conviction on his part that this measure is in the national interest; that it is for the good of the country, and should be passed. As a mater of fact, it was no longer ago than this morning at the White House, at our leadership meeting, that the President again urged us to do everything we could to bring about the passage of this measure.

As a matter of fact, the whole problem of water conservation is one of the most important things before the country. In many places, on occasion, we have too much water. On occasion, water can be like fire. Fire is good at the right place, but if it gets out of hand, it can be very bad, very destructive. The same can be said of water.

At the moment, today, there is going on out in my district a hearing having to do with flood control. I would be there as would my adjoining colleague, Mr. MADDEN of Indiana, but for our legislative responsibilities here. There are other times when we do not have enough water and the problem then is how shall we undertake to control this matter of our water resources.

Let me say to my friends out in my section of the country, this problem of the conservation of our water resources for the uses that are necessary is not confined alone to the intermountain country, or the West, or the arid areas. It was not so long ago that I had occasion to be in a discussion with the president of one of the biggest industries in the Middle West, the headquarters of that company being in Cincinnati. We got to talking about the availability of water for industrial and other uses and he said that while on occasion the Ohio gets up to flood stage, there come times in the season when water is at the lowest point. He predicted that in 20 years Cincinnati would experience difficulty because of a shortage of water for industrial purposes.

So, while at the moment I suppose the matter of water is of much greater interest to the people in the western arid and semiarid areas, let us not forget that the time may well come when these same problems will be besetting us.

The upper Colorado project provides for storage and for the conservation of water for use. I am quite sure that much of the water that would be saved for beneficial use, if this measure is passed and these projects are carried out, would be of tremendous value not only to that section of the country but other sections as well, and to the country as a whole, instead of going to waste as it does now at certain seasons of the year, flowing into the ocean.

The upper Colorado project was proposed after decades of negotiations, agreements, and research. Perhaps the most significant event leading up to the present project was the formulation in 1922, 34 years ago, of a unique and comprehensive document known as the Colorado River compact. This compact was approved by the seven States of the Colorado River Basin and is recognized by the Congress of the United States and by the President as the law of the river.

This document is unique in that it divided the waters of the river on a basis of equity before any major development was undertaken. It was recognized early that there was not enough water there for all of the use that might be developed, so the compact prepared the way for the development of the area known as the lower basin of the Colorado River, including principally California, Nevada, and Arizona. Such magnificant structures as Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, Parker Dam, and the All American Canal followed this compact, with benefit to the lower basin. The upper basin States, where 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River originates, are now ready to proceed with a siimlar development. This program has taken years to plan, years to prepare for your consideration today. It has been

devised by the Bureau of Reclamation, by the Senate, by House committees, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and it has received, as I have said before, the wholehearted endorsement and support of the President of the United States.

The total depletion of water from the river in the upper basin, including all present projects, will be approximately 4 million acre-feet annually. This, I am informed, is well within the 7½ million acre-feet allocated to the upper basin by the compact.

This, then, as I see it, is a project planned in accord with a compact and meeting the terms of that compact. On moral and legal grounds I say it is right. It gives to the four States in the upper basin what so far as I am concerned was clearly contemplated when the compact was drawn.

From the standpoint of benefits to the Nation it also is right. It will create new markets for goods manufactured in other parts of the Nation. It will provide for development of the raw materials and other natural resources in an area that has become known as the mineral treasure chest of the Nation. It is advantageous to national defense. It will strengthen a large area, and when any region is strengthened our Nation grows greater. This has been the history of the past and it will be the history of the future as long as we seek and plan for progress.

I think it should be clearly understood that one obstacle to the enactment of this legislation last year has been removed, and that is the Echo Park Dam, that met with the strong opposition of conservationists all over the country. That has been removed.

So I urge your support of the Colorado River storage project because it meets the provisions of an honorable compact, because it has firm justification in benefits that will accrue to the Nation as a whole, because it will aid national defense, and because it will be another step forward for our Nation in the development of our own resources.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, should this matter be disposed of on the rule, it would be a matter of disposing of money at the rate of $93 million a minute when you consider the cost of this project. I think this Congress would hardly want to handle such a difficult, complex, and expensive problem in that cursory fashion. Therefore, although I shall probably vote against the rule for the purpose of indicating my opposition to the legislation I do feel it deserves a great deal of consideration, more than can be given in the short hour provided on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I may extend our remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills, H. R. 9583 and H. R. 9589, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act for the purpose of building what is known as the Interstate System. The purpose of introducing these bills is to provide the funds to reimburse the various States for highways already built or under construction that will be designated as part of the Interstate System. Taking my own State of New York, in which I am very much interested, we realized a number of years ago the great necessity and the importance of building highways. Just as rapidly as possible, we have moved ahead to the end that now we are completing what is known as the New York State Thruway, part of the Interstate System, which runs from New York State to Buffalo and beyond that point, a total of almost 600 miles at a cost of approximately $900 million.

Under the present Fallon bill, H. R. 8336, on which hearings are being held before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, credits are provided, but no funds or formula for paying the credits. The bills I have introduced provide two methods. One bill provides that the reimbursement money necessary be deducted over a period of years from the total sum of $24,800,000,000 authorized in the bill. The second bill increases the money authorized to $27,800,000,000 to provide the reimbursement money necessary under the credits provided.

New York State, and several other States, that have moved ahead to meet their obligations of both their economy and national defense and have built their highways in accordance with Federal specifications, would be penalized unless the provisions of these bills are enacted.

I might point out that New York State is not only penalized in this instance because it is and has been progressive in building necessary facilities. The same thing applies to school legislation and other types of Federal aid because, while funds are voted by the Congress to assist various States in the Union that have not kept up with the times, New York will provide a great deal of the tax money necessary to assist in meeting the current and future demands. But there is never provision in legislation to reimburse New York and the several other States for facilities built and for which the taxpayers of the State will be paying off the bonds for many years to come. This to me is unfair and unjust. I am joined in this feeling by my Republican colleagues from the State of New York. I might further add that the Governor of the State of New York has sent letters to all of the members of the New York congressional delegation requesting the reimbursement features embodied in these bills. The chairman of the New York State Republican Committee has also taken this position and has gone on record supporting these reimbursement features. I offer these bills as amendments to present bills being discussed to provide the money that is necessary.

I have also embodied in these bills a section providing that, under all the contracts for the construction of these highway projects in the national system, the contractors and subcontractors pay to all laborers and mechanics wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act—40 United States Code, section 276–a. Last year I supported this provision in the bill that was defeated, and again I support it as a matter that is just and fair to the laborers and mechanics throughout our country.

I shall bend every effort and seek the support of the Members of the House that the provision for reimbursement as well as the prevailing wage sections be injected into any highway legislation that comes before this House and is acted upon by the membership. Highways are sorely needed throughout our country. I support this to the fullest extent, but I am also cognizant of the fact and have been for many years that, while a great portion of the taxes paid into the Federal Government and expended for relief and aid to many parts of our country comes from New York State, very little filters back to the taxpayers of the State of New York, and, when I refer to the State of New York, I also have in mind other States, such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, California, and several others.

JUSTICE UNDER FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighbor in Nassau County [Mr. BECKER] has today introduced jointly with my colleague [Mr. PILLION] two bills which seek to alleviate, by amendment, some of the inequities of H. R. 8836. As a member of the New York State delegation, I am continuously aware of the great burden thrown upon the taxpayers of my State, in support of Federal projects, and I commend my two colleagues for their timely action.

These two bills provide for appropriate repayment and credits for interstate roads already constructed, not merely by intent, but specifically, and provide for recognition of the Davis-Bacon Act in the employment of laborers and mechanics on initial construction work. In order to design a highway bill which will in reality aid our 48 States in the constructon of their roads, it is essential that they be included in any measure upon which we are asked to vote.

The present highway bill will be much the better if the aforementioned amendments are adopted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my friend from southern California has indicated there will be no attempt to defeat the rule on this measure. I agree with him that it would be impossible in the short time that we have to attempt to dispel the fog or, I should say, smog, with all deference to my friend from southern California, that has been cast over this measure.

I think our minority leader properly advised you when he said that this measure has been under consideration for a good many, many years, not the exact measure before you today, but the general investigation of this project.

During the last 7 years more than $10 million has been spent in engineering investigations alone on the feasibility of this project. Some of the greatest engineers in this land have been at work on it, the same engineers who designed and helped construct the Hoover Dam, Shasta, Parker, Davis Dam, Hungry Horse, and other great dams in this country.

This matter has also been considered about as thoroughly, or more thoroughly, by the committees of this Congress than any measure—at least any measure that has been before our House Interior Committee.

The other body considered the matter for a good many, many weeks; it came up for consideration in the Senate and was passed by a vote of 58 to 22.

When the matter was considered before your House committee in 1954 it was impossible to bring it to the floor for action before adjournment. It was also considered for a good many weeks last year; and, of course, this year also. I believe there have been more weeks of hearings on this measure than any measure before the committee.

The bill was reported out of committee by a vote of 20 to 6. Of course, it has passed the Rules Committee, and it is now before you.

I simply call these matters to your attention to indicate that we are not coming before you with a hastily drawn or ill-conceived measure.

Since as far back as 1922 when these waters were divided between the lower basin States and the upper basin States, there have been continuous investigations. I might also state that in the Boulder Canyon Act a provision was included that part of the revenue from the Hoover Dam was to go into investigations of projects in the upper basin States so they could go ahead and develop their projects. This money, together with money put up by the States themselves, has gone into these investigations. To us in the arid States where we have less than 12 inches of rainfall a year, I want to assure you that this is a matter of life and death.

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman from Indiana suggested a thought which to me is rather persuasive in reaching a decision on this issue, and that is that it is presently proposed to extend to the upper Colorado Basin the same extent of Federal aid or Federal participation that has previously been given in the development of the lower Colorado.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and I may also state the total amount of expenditures made in the lower basin States taking into consideraton reclamation, flood control, power, and so forth is tremendous. The amount of reclamation money that has been spent in southern California is absolutely fabulous.

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I must refuse to yield. I have only a short time and wish to complete my statement.

I would simply like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hoover Dam was constructed, as the gentleman from Indiana said, it was provided, and the State of California was required to and did enter into a limitation agreement providing that they would not take any more water than was provided in the limitation act; and the Colorado compact divided the waters half to the lower basin and half to the upper basin.

We have been all these years trying to get our water divided among ourselves, and our projects developed. Now we come before the Congress with a comprehensive plan to permit us to go ahead with the development.

I would also like to remind you that 99 percent of this money will be paid back, the major portion of it with interest. We are taxing our lands and purchasing the water and power to help pay for it. The power that is to be generated will be sold in our own area. All we are asking is for an advance of these funds, the major portion of which is going to come out of the reclamation fund made up of moneys collected from our own States. In my State of Utah 73 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government. The Government receives oil and gas revenues from my State which go into the reclamation fund. We feel it is our own money. We are asking for the right to use it and the Reclamation Act provides it cannot be used for any other purpose than to construct reclamation projects.

All we are asking is for our own money and the opportunity to work out our own destiny.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pass the rule which will give the House an opportunity to listen to 4 hours of honest, sincere debate on the upper Colorado River project. If you do not care to hear the debate, perchance, you might read the arguments, pro and con, in the quiet of your office or of your study. But, because of the importance of this legislation it is absolutely necessary that both sides have an opportunity to be heard. It was reported by the Interior Committee by a 20-to-6 vote with 3 not voting.

We are not dealing, in this legislation, with a matter that can be resolved in terms of hours, days, or years. It is not a matter of States, areas, or localities, but of all the United States. We are dealing more specifically with a matter that will find its place in the future of every man, of every woman, and every child in the United States of America, for future generations to come.

I want to say, in all frankness, that with the adoption of this rule we will be able to show that it has the support of this administration and complete bipartisan support of the Congress. We will show that it is economically feasible; we will show that its engineering is correct, that it will pay back to the Treasury the money that is invested in the development of this resource. We will show that southern California will not lose one drop of water guaranteed them under the compact of 1922. We will demonstrate and show, to your satisfaction, that the bill does not cost $4 billion or untold millions, to every State in the Union. We will show that the land to be irrigated eventually under this development is only about 132,000 new acres, not 586,000 acres as the opponents would have you believe. We will show that it will help the Navaho Indians and the good people of this tribe.

When the Colorado River compact was entered into nearly a quarter of a century ago, California, and lower basin States, under this compact were allocated 7½ million acre-feet of water each year. The same amount was allocated to the four upper States. Water was also promised to Mexico.

Southern California, under the Colorado compact made in 1922, approved and signed in 1928 the building of Hoover, Davis, Parker, and Imperial Dams, and also the Palo Verde weir. Much of this construction was under the guise of flood control and did not cost southern California one thin dime. Southern California has prospered fabulously under the wise use of this stored water. They have had a tremendous economic growth because of the electricity produced at the several dams. The city of Los Angeles could not exist without the long canal giving water from the dams to the city. I am glad they have had that growth. It is part of a growing, dynamic America.

In my judgment, the key to the economy of the West rests in the ability of its people to control two of their great natural resources—land and water. Without the electric power generated from the Hoover Dam, the industrial cities of southern California would not exist. The great Northwest has had its remarkable development because of the projects on the Columbia River. There would be no Los Angeles, no Spokane, Seattle, or Long Beach, as we know them today, if it were not for the men in Congress, in the Government, and in all walks of life who had the vision and the courage to build these projects.

The upper States in the Colorado River project now are asking for their 7½ million acre-feet of water. They are asking that it be stored in reservoirs and that eventually about 132 million acres of land will receive water. They are asking that electric energy be developed, and, indeed, about two-thirds of the money for this project is for the development of electric energy and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest.

The great growth of southern California can be attributed to the wise use of water and electric energy. The same stability and growth of communities in the upper basin States will become a reality when this project is in full force and effect.

The upper Colorado project has been the subject of one of the more strenuous public campaigns in many years. Your

desk has been flooded with propaganda from the Colorado River Association, with offices at 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Before the debate is ended, I am sure that many of you will realize that much of this propaganda has no basis in fact. Propaganda that this would cost other States millions of dollars has no basis of fact. The engineering feasibility has been established. All these facts will be established.

The project has been conceived and designed by some of the most sincere and capable experts who have had the benefit and experience dating back to the designing and construction of the Hoover Dam. I am sure that Members of Congress must be confused because of the statements and counterstatements relative to this project. The only way these misunderstandings and confusions can be resolved is to listen to or read the debate which will follow on the passage of this rule.

What we are considering in this bill is a matter of extreme national interest. It will permit the people in the upper States to utilize the water guaranteed them by the solemn compact with the States in the lower basin, and it will permit another forward step in the development of the national resources in the United States of America.

A rule has been granted that will permit discussion on this legislation which is so important to our welfare. The rule recognizes that amendments might be necessary to make this a better piece of legislation.

I would like to make it clear that I have no personal interest in this legislation. My State will receive no water and not one kilowatt of electricity will be delivered in Nebraska from any of this project. I am interested because I believe the project to be a vital part in the future of a growing, dynamic America. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

You may not agree with the proponents or opponents, but I trust you will permit the Congress to work its will by free and open discussion on this vital legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that the 7½ million acre-feet under the Sante Fe compact goes to all the lower basin States. I do not want the gentleman to give away all of Arizona's water in such a cavalier manner. Arizona is a State in the lower basin and certainly expects to share in that 7½ million acre-feet. California has, by her own act, limited herself to 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct; thank you.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would just like to say at this point that there are arguments on the other side as to whether or not the 4.4 million acre-feet to California and the other water to the lower basin is imperiled by this project, and I shall discuss it further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will. In the judgment of many, California's water will not be affected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced today with probably one of the most complicated measures which we have had to consider in this 84th Congress. The time of 4 hours, I am sure, will be used to the full by those who are for and against this measure. It is my hope that during the time of that 4-hour debate many of us who believe this bill should be defeated can appeal to the reason and good judgment of the Members of this House to the point where this bill can be defeated. The Members from southern California, on both sides of the aisle, may be placed by the proponents of this bill in a false position. They say that we are water hogs, that we want all the water in the river, and all that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, this compact has been in controversy for more than 25 years. Over 20 interstate commissions have tried to get together to determine what is the meaning of the Colorado River compact. At this very time, as a result of a suit by the State of Arizona against the State of California, the matter is before the Supreme Court for the determination of the meaning of the compact.

There are at least 12 different points that the people in southern California honestly and sincerely feel should be clarified. The only place we can get that clarification, interstate conferences having failed, is before the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have rested our case before the Supreme Court and we are ready and willing to abide by the opinion of the Supreme Court when it comes, whatever that opinion may be. It may be contrary to the belief of southern California. On the other hand, it may support some of our beliefs as to what the compact means. But we honestly and sincerely believe that this tremendous and complicated piece of legislation should not be passed while there is pending in the Supreme Court a suit between States of the compact, which will affect all of the States within the compact; the clarification of which will affect the rights of the separate States, including that of southern California. We feel our contractual rights are in jeopardy. We know of no other way to find out than to seek the judgment of the Supreme Court. We do not want any ill feeling between neighboring States. The Members from California have stood aside on 10 different occasions when legislation conferring benefits upon the upper basin States has been offered. We supported the compact for the upper basin and the approval of the contract by the Congress. We have been willing that money that comes from Hoover Dam go to the upper basin States for engineering projects over the years. We are not a dog in the manger on this project. We merely seek to protect our rights.

We have 6 million people in southern California that are depending upon the water from the Colorado. And I should like to say that the municipalities and the irrigation districts and water districts of California have expended over $700 million in aqueducts, irrigation ditches, and transmission lines from Hoover Dam.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If the decision of the Supreme Court is in favor of southern California, what effect would that have upon the project as it is presented to the House?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In my opinion, if the Supreme Court should recommend in favor of southern California's interpretation of the compact, it would protect our rights under the compact. But if it should rule against our interpretation of the compact, we fear we would lose some of that protection.

Mr. DIES. That is not quite the question. What I want to know is, if southern California won the case would that change the nature and effect of the project; would it destroy the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. DIES. Or have any effect upon it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, as far as I know; it would not.

Mr. DIES. Then what has the case got to do with the project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It might modify the contract to give protection to southern California for water rights which if it were decided against us would make some of our present contracts null and void.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Also in the case before the Supreme Court is the definition of beneficial consumptive use as it applies to the compact.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. That makes a tremendous difference in this particular instance, because that definition makes a difference between the upper basin and the lower basin as to what net water is available for use; and also there is the matter of something in excess of 2 million acre-feet of water claimed by the Indians that might have to be subtracted from the water available between the lower and the upper basins.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to clarify a point that seemed to be in doubt following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the question as to whether this project came into the same category as far as equal benefits are concerned as the lower Colorado development and the Hoover Dam.

It does not by any means, because before a steam shovel was turned for the building of the Hoover Dam, and that was after years and years of engineering

and investigation as to the best location, before a steam shovel was turned there was a firm contract agreed to by California and the Federal Government that California would pay for the cost of Hoover Dam by consuming the power developed at the dam. It was written down and signed and agreed, and that has been lived up to.

This project does not equal that in any sense whatsoever. This project is seeking to obtain all of the money from the Federal Treasury without any assurance of any return except from the result of the sale of the power and the reclamation of the land eventually. That is paying beforehand, while we in California gave every assurance and guaranty of the payment of it before the project was started.

Another thing, so far as the jeopardy of the lower Colorado River water is concerned, is that there is in the minority report a reliable and a very dependable statement made by Raymond Hill and several other engineers. I quote Mr. Hill because I know him personally. I have had personal contact with him. I know his reputation. He was retained as a consulting engineer by the State of Colorado. He gave to the State of Colorado this statement as a result of his survey:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry—

That is the dividing point—

to supply the full right of the Metropolitan Water District, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

Here is an engineer's report that that river compact is going to be violated if these projects are put into effect.

The report goes on further to say that the building of the upper Colorado River projects will be disastrous to the lower river States' water supply.

I recommend that the rule be defeated, because I do not think this project is in a form in which it should be debated at this time. It should be recommitted to the committee. More study should be made of it. It is not in a shape in which we should consider it at this time. I am going to vote against the rule just as I voted against the rule the first time it was on the floor, when this House defeated the rule the first time this project was offered to the House for consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Has this project ever been before this body before?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This project has never been before this body before.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The rule was defeated.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the rule was not.

The only reason I take a little time here is to discuss the question of the so-called lawsuit pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. That is just another method that those in southern California are using in an attempt to defeat this bill.

May I outline to you that the people of southern California and all of the people of the Colorado River Basin States agreed on a compact, providing for a division of the water between the upper basin States and the lower basin States. The southern Californians insist that we should deliver to them an average of 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period. In order to get the Boulder Canyon project approved the State of California by its legislature, adopted a bill which the Congress of the United States directed them to do under no circumstances and under no condition were they to use or attempt to assert any right in excess of 4,400 million acre-feet plus one-half of the surplus thereof. That was in the original Boulder Dam Project Act approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057). Not until this bill began to see the light of day did you ever have southern California or anywhere else, anybody question that compact at all. The southern Californians went to the Supreme Court of the United States and did their best to get the sovereign States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico into it for the purpose of then coming before the Congress saying, "You cannot pass it because it is now in the Supreme Court of the United States." The Supreme Court of the United States turned down the request of southern California and said that this compact as it deals with the upper basin States and this compact and this bill, as we expect to pass it, did not in any manner, and would not in any manner affect this bill nor would we be engaged in any litigation whatsoever.

It is my thought, and I think the record will bear it out, that southern California at the time the Hoover Dam was built, agreed, as the gentleman from California said a moment ago, to repay by paying for the energy and for the water. But what did they do? They came to this Congress in 1940, after that contract was entered into wherein they agreed to pay approximately 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the electric energy they wanted at Hoover Dam, and asked this Congress for permission to rewrite that contract. That contract is rewritten and today they are getting that energy for 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. That is one of the things they are fighting it for because they know their obligation to pay it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that I will not interrupt the gentleman at the high point of his speech, I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House how many acres of new land will be put into cultivation if this legislation passes the House?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to the gentleman that that will all be brought out in debate, however, I will answer it now and say approximately 135,000 acres of new land.

Mr. Speaker, first may I express my deep appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for permitting me to have this much of his all too limited time, and also I wish to thank my very fine and helpful friends, the Speaker pro tempore of this body, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the former floor leader of the House on the Republican side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for the fine statements that they made in support of the rule. Much of what has been said here during the last half hour, of course, has its place in the debate. My purpose here is to use the time which I have been given to suggest to my colleagues that this legislation is of sufficient significance and importance to have the rule adopted and to proceed to debate.

Naturally, as sponsor of the bill, H. R. 3383, I support House Resolution 311 now under consideration, and sincerely trust that the Members of this honorable body will approve such resolution and make possible full debate of the upper Colorado River project legislation—legislation about which much has been said and publicized, and of which a great part has been misleading.

My residence in the area to be directly served by the project, which will be authorized by the bill under approval of House Resolution 311, began as a boy in 1904. It has been continuous since then. Although I retain a great warmth of affection for the place of my nativity, the district so ably represented by our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], nevertheless, I shall be eternally grateful that my parents found the needed haven in western Colorado when my mother's health made it imperative for us to find a new home.

My forebears helped pioneer and settle many areas of the East. I am happy that the same fate fell to me as far as a part of the Rocky Mountain West is concerned. The place where my home has been for a half century was out from under Indian rule only 20 years when I moved there. I am the only Member of this great body who is an actual resident of the upper Colorado River basin, an area larger than the whole of New England. I believe that I am qualified to tell you of the hopes and ambitions of the people of that undeveloped storehouse of a large quantity of our country's natural-resource values. Here is an area with its people just waiting for the opportunity to make its contribution to the general advancement and welfare of our great Nation. The upper basin area of the Colorado is a land of great promise. Its agricultural resources now limited by the topography of the area can be developed further. Its mineral resources are virtually untapped. I do not need to advise this body that the upper basin contains the greatest uranium-producing area in this country and perhaps in the Western Hemisphere.

Just a few miles from my home lie mountains of oil shale, vast beds of coal and mountains of phosphates—to mention a few of the items comprising the mineral wealth of my area. The same, of course, is true of New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These tremendous mineral deposits with their vast potential benefits for the people of our land, wait only for the availability of power at reasonable rates and the availability of sure supplies of domestic and industrial water. The downrush of the waters of the Colorado will provide the bootstrap by which this area can pull itself up, paying its own way as it goes, and giving incalculable values to the Nation generally.

I stand here in the well of the House with a feeling of great hope that this day will see a generation-old dream come true—a dream of the people of the upper Colorado River Basin area for a rather limited number of new farms, a somewhat greater number of old farms with a sure supply of vital water at some period in the future beginning not earlier than 1964, a limited amount of municipal water development, and electric power as an incidental feature to bring new mines, mills, and factories to develop our abundant resources. If indeed industrialism proceeds as visualized much of the agricultural water will be taken for cities. In it also is the first necessary step in a long-range program to aid a large segment of our Navaho Indians.

We of the upper Colorado River Basin have been working toward this sound development for the better part of this century. Bills to achieve it, following upon negotiation, planning and interstate agreement, have been before the Congress for several years. Now the great effort is at a time of decision—the bill is ready for House action. We of the upper Colorado Basin area and States directly interested therein stand ready to justify the Nation's faith in our plan with our assurances for repayment of the financial credit we here seek. There is no better demonstration of our faith in this project.

I cannot here add dramatic new testimonials to the soundness of this legislation. I would not, if I were able to do so, guild it as the lily, but I know it to be fundamentally sound and worthwhile—worthwhile to the underdeveloped area through which the Colorado River now flows as an erratic and wasting asset, and equally worthwhile to the Nation as well.

This Nation was built by, and has always profited from, the development of its resources. Bonneville, Coulee, Central California, Boulder—all these stand as monuments to the gain for the Nation to be achieved by initial advances from the Government.

I have not time now to refute each dramatic thrust that has been made against this legislation—thrusts made by skillful and well-financed opposition. Such opportunity will be afforded to us with the adoption of the rule under consideration. It is my hope that the facts will be the basis of decision in your case, as it has been in mine. These speak for themselves and speak in solid support for this Federal resource investment.

These facts have grown out of extensive hearings. As chairman of the committee which held these hearings, I made sure that each point of view was fully, even redundantly, heard and considered, whether fact or folly. We did not proceed as partisans or as wastrels, but rather as men seeking to bring to fruition the type of development which has proven to be so valuable in other areas, and to the Nation generally. Evidence of this careful consideration can be found in the newly adopted provisions of the bill excluding and protecting national park and monument areas—which legislative protection was sought by conservation-minded groups. Further evidence is found in our limit on the total appropriation to an amount considerably below the figure approved by the other body, but a figure which we believe to be adequate to do the job.

This is now being submitted to you from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for your judgment. In the reports we have offered facts to undergird the conclusions which resulted from our extensive consideration.

Beyond this, to each of you who have had a question to ask of me, I have given a plain and forthright answer—as your questions deserved. I have not, nor will I now, paint this logical program as a glittering package of indescribable and limitless value, but my colleagues and I shall do our best to present to you its worth and possibilities to the area and Nation. It will provide the economic stimulus for a now underdeveloped area which will enable it to build new farms, new cities, new factories, and create other income and tax-gathering facilities out of which repayment can be made. It is not something new, and for a testimonial of its economic worth and value, just turn your ear to the concerted opposition rising up from southern California which would like to profit from the use of the same water even though they signed solemn agreements that it was not theirs.

I know only too well that all of you have been treated to carefully calculated points of opposition ranging from purported statistical data to side-show routines about rock that dissolves in water. To those of you on my right convinced that you do not favor this legislation, I offer this last chance to join in a new and challenging adventure. To those of you on my left in this same situation I offer the reminder that this is favored by past and present leaders and spokesmen of your great party and has an honorable history back to the administration of the able and dynamic Theodore Roosevelt. It is not a partisan matter at all.

What is it that we propose? We propose at last to control the upper half of the turbulent Colorado River, much as it has been controlled by Federal help in its southern reaches. To do so, we need a giant dam, not as high as Hoover, but more expensive, to tame the erratic flow. This dam, Glen Canyon, and the falling water from it converted to electrical energy, will enable us to put water to use in development elsewhere for farms, cities and people; for mine and mill and factory. These economic creations will generate the new income necessary to repay the advances made during construction. That is all there is to it. True, the $760 million figure is a considerable sum, but recall only that the repayment to the Government, in that it involves interest on two-thirds of the features, will be even larger. It is not, unfortunately, enough of a return to attract private industry, but it is enough to bring wealth, net new wealth, new income, new taxes, new markets, to the Nation. That is the criteria upon which I support this legislation. It will provide the necessary development of now underdeveloped resources in a manner that will return the advance. Is it not good enough for you as well?

Just to save a lot of time, I should like to cover in pointed terms what this bill does not contain. I realize that this is perhaps not the best way to approach the virtues of any legislation, but until we clear the tangled underbrush of calculated confusion, we cannot see the trees. There are many interests and groups who fear to have the trees seen lest they be appreciated and approved. Accordingly, they take the devious path of confusion. The upper Colorado storage and development project is not something new, something recently concocted by a bunch of harebrained planners bent on development at any cost. The history of this proposal, rather, goes back before the turn of the century when farseeing men began the development of the arid West by means of irrigation. This development was a key point in the necessity which moved the States along the Colorado to come to binding agreement on the division of its waters which culminated in the Santa Fe compact in 1922. This development was foreseen, supported, and advanced by such farseeing political leaders of our country as Herbert Hoover, Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Calvin Coolidge, and a list of highly respected conservationists too long to include here. Indeed, some of the very dams proposed as a part of this upper basin development were surveyed and contemplated for construction by the lower basin before they settled on a high dam in Black Canyon, since known as the Hoover Dam. This development merely provides for the use of the waters of the Colorado River and this has been contemplated, planned, supported, and advanced by each negotiation, legislative enactment, compact, and proposal since the early settlers were able to see that water was life in the West. This is not to say that all has ever been harmonious or unanimous. Water is the lifeblood of the West, and if I seem repetitious, let it merely indicate a measure of the conflict that has occurred over its control and use. I wish each of you had time to go over the history of the development of this great region stretching from the Rockies to the Gulf of California. I wish you could go back with me over the long negotiations, battles, and final agreements affecting this river. It is a fascinating story with able and energetic

characters, a worthwhile plot, and more than adequate drama. It has many authors—men now forgotten, men once famous but now passed into memory, and men who were there and are still available to recount the story in personal terms even though time is taking its toll. It has many side plots and plots within plots, yet it is all a consistent part of the whole drama of development in the Colorado River Basin—and how general development is tied irrevocably to the waters of this great stream.

The bill, consideration of which would be in order upon the approval of the resolution now before us, does not authorize, or even contemplate, the construction of any facility having any adverse effect on any area reserved as a national park or national monument. On the other hand, the legislation as approved by the committee specifically provides for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument should it be endangered by the construction of the Glen Canyon unit. It goes even further and provides that it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be in any national park or monument.

The suggested legislation does not authorize or of necessity contemplate any billion dollar boondoggle to siphon away funds from the National Treasury or economy. In fact, the nonreimbursable cost allocations in this legislation are very small with 99 percent of all the funds advanced by the Federal Government to be repaid in full to the Federal Treasury with those costs allocated to power, and municipal water repayable with interest.

The bill does not involve, either as now presented or originally proposed, any multibillion dollar subsidy to this area of the West. In fact, the legislation contains no authorization for subsidy as the word is so often misused these days. Evidence will be presented by the proponents of the legislation to show that the benefit-cost ratio of this particular project is most favorable to the Nation generally. The plan to be considered by this body does not involve or even contemplate any use of water which will have adverse effect upon present legitimate and legal uses based upon the law of the river at any place along the river, in its basin or in areas now served by waters from the river. In fact, the proponents will show that provisions have been incorporated in the legislation to cause the law of the river to apply in every possible instance. The bill does not involve or even contemplate any sudden or eventual use of the Colorado River water not known to any informed person of the whole area for the last three decades, nor does it involve any theory, proposal, or Federal aid not equally well known and previously supported by several States and legal entities of the area now supporting or opposing the present program to be authorized by the legislation to be considered. In fact, it conforms, and in some respects more conservatively, to the established procedures, rules, and regulations for reclamation developments heretofore authorized by this body.

The bill does not require vast sums of money from other States of the Union to their damage and hurt. In fact, it requires only a limited amount of aid over the necessary construction period from funds other than those available in the revolving reclamation fund. Well-grounded estimates show that in no year during the construction period would the Federal Government be called upon to furnish from the General Treasury more than $18 million a year, practically all of which would be repayable.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate power costs in excess of that presently charged or available in the foreseeable future for the area to be served; nor does it contemplate hydro power development adversely affecting our diminishing resources of hydrocarbons; nor does it contemplate any program that would adversely affect our nuclear power reactor projects. In fact, the development of the upper Colorado River project would aid the development of the other programs and the power produced would be furnished at a rate benefiting the users.

The bill does not involve or even contemplate the culture of any esoteric food or any crop now in great surplus or in competition with those produced in any other area. In fact, the amount of land to be developed under the project is considerably less in acreage than the amount now being withdrawn from agricultural production for military, municipal, highway, and other uses made necessary by an increasing population, and the progress of our economy.

The bill does not involve any flimsy program hastily thrown together without a thought as to its integration to the needs of the whole area or the Nation. In fact, on the contrary it is a well thought out and well planned project carried as far along in concrete plans and specifications as funds available have permitted. Of course, there is considerable engineering work to be done yet to insure that the various facilities of the project can be constructed effectively, safely, and economically.

The bill does not, of necessity, involve the appropriation of money at a time when the budget may not be exactly balanced. However, with the approachment of the time when the budget is balanced, the much-publicized phony interest and nimble numbers charges would assume their proper perspective and relationship. In fact, the national benefits which would be possible under the authorization after it comes into operation would aid and further our national welfare to a material degree.

The sponsors of H. R. 3383 and companion bills, if given the opportunity, will present in an orderly, and we trust, effective manner the facts and procedures pertinent to the legislation. We respectfully ask for your favorable support of the rule and close attention to the matters which are factually involved.

I wish to suggest to my good colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that it is a rather pleasing experience for me to come this far along in the consideration of this legislation and find ourselves in mutual agreement at least on one thing and that is that this legislation is sufficiently important to be considered by the House.

May I advise of the amount of consideration that has been given to this bill? More than 125 hours were devoted to the taking of testimony by committees in the 83d and 84th Congresses, and to careful and close consideration of the matter.

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

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman tell the committee how that time was divided?

Mr. ASPINALL. With the exception of about 6 hours which were given to departmental witnesses to present their case, the time was divided 50–50, 50 percent of the time to the proponents and 50 percent of the time to the opponents.

More than 2,800 pages of printed testimony are available for the Members of this body to study if they see fit.

Of those witnesses who appeared before our committee during the 84th Congress, 38 were basin proponents, 1 was an REA spokesman supporting the bill; 3 were Indian representatives supporting the legislation; 2 were private-utility spokesmen supporting the legislation; 11 were conservationists who were opposed to the legislation at that time; 2 were in general support; 15 southern California witnesses appeared in opposition, and only 1 witness other than this group from southern California appeared in opposition to this legislation.

When my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], suggests that we are bringing to this body an entirely different piece of legislation than that originally put before the House, the gentleman is absolutely mistaken. The germaneness of what is proposed in the amendment has been passed upon by those who are familiar with parliamentary practice before this body.

We have stated we would not attempt to bypass the important Rules Committee in any particular whatsoever.

One of the most important amendments that has been placed in the substitute is to the effect that no national park or monument area shall be trespassed upon in the construction of this project.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not all of the so-called conservation controversies have been resolved? Is the conservation group satisfied with this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. All of the conservation opposition that was formerly placed before our committee to my knowledge has been withdrawn. Some of them not only have withdrawn their opposition, but they now support this legislation wholeheartedly, as is shown in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That includes the Sierra Club of California?

Mr. ASPINALL. That includes the Sierra Club of California, under the able leadership of Mr. Brower.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. May I make a correction? Mr. Brower has contacted me within the past few days, continuing to voice his opposition to the proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. We are not going to get into any argument on that. I have stated what is my opinion.

We have made one change in the substitute which goes to the formula for repayment. We have done this, as you will be advised, in order to see to it that the waters allocated to the upper basin through the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River compact of 1948 are properly allocated to bring about the use of such allocations heretofore made to the various States. By direction we have attempted to do what the former bill did by indirection. It is the feeling of the committee that this amendment is germane.

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

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

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman has just referred to a list of interests that have approved the bill. Would the gentleman care to inform the House whether or not the private power companies of Utah, Colorado, and Arizona approve this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall advise the gentleman from New York that there appeared before our committee two representatives of the private power utilities in that area, stating that they represented some 10 private utilities. They advised the committee that they were willing to accept the responsibility of distributing the power that was surplus to the needs of the REA.

Mr. DONOVAN. The answer of the gentleman then is that this bill is all right with the private power utilities of that area; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. In that part of the area we have had friendly operations. They have come into the picture and suggested to us their willingness to accept this responsibility.

Mr. DONOVAN. So that this is one piece of public power legislation in the West that the private power companies do not oppose; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will let the gentleman answer his own question.

Mr. DONOVAN. Would the gentleman care to inform the House as to what knowledge he has as to why the private power utilities concur in this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, some question has been raised here during debate upon the rule as to the propriety of certain actions that will be taken. It is my understanding that the commitee proposes to offer an amendment to its bill in the form of a substitute. I take it if the substitute is germane it may be offered. If it is not germane an objection would stop it. Therefore, I see nothing irregular about this procedure. It is perfectly in order.

Mr. Speaker, while I personally am constrained to oppose this bill and vote against it, it is of sufficient importance that the rule should be adopted and full discussion had as is provided under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 354, nays 26, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—354

Abbitt	Christopher	Green, Oreg.
Abernethy	Chudoff	Green, Pa.
Adair	Church	Gregory
Addonizio	Clark	Griffiths
Albert	Clevenger	Gross
Alexander	Cole	Gubser
Alger	Colmer	Gwinn
Allen, Calif.	Cooley	Hagen
Allen, Ill.	Coon	Hale
Andersen, H. Carl	Cooper	Halleck
	Corbett	Hand
Andresen, August H.	Coudert	Harden
	Cramer	Hardy
Anfuso	Cretella	Harris
Ashley	Crumpacker	Harrison, Nebr.
Ashmore	Cunningham	Harrison, Va.
Aspinall	Curtis, Mass.	Harvey
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mo.	Hays, Ark.
Avery	Dague	Hayworth
Ayres	Davidson	Healey
Bailey	Davis, Tenn.	Hébert
Baker	Davis, Wis.	Henderson
Baldwin	Dawson, Ill.	Herlong
Barrett	Dawson, Utah	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Deane	Hess
Bass, Tenn.	Delaney	Hiestand
Bates	Dempsey	Hill
Baumhart	Derounian	Hinshaw
Beamer	Devereux	Hoeven
Becker	Dies	Hoffman, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Diggs	Hoffman, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Dingell	Holland
Berry	Dixon	Holmes
Betts	Dodd	Holtzman
Blatnik	Dollinger	Hope
Boggs	Dolliver	Horan
Boland	Donovan	Huddleston
Bolling	Dorn, N. Y.	Hull
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	Hyde
	Dowdy	Ikard
Bolton, Oliver P.	Doyle	Jarman
	Durham	Jennings
Bonner	Edmondson	Jensen
Bosch	Elliott	Johansen
Bow	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.
Bowler	Engle	Johnson, Wis.
Boyle	Evins	Jonas
Bray	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brooks, La.	Fascell	Judd
Brooks, Tex.	Feighan	Karsten
Brown, Ga.	Fenton	Kean
Brown, Ohio	Fernandez	Kearney
Brownson	Fino	Kearns
Broyhill	Fisher	Keating
Buckley	Fjare	Kee
Budge	Flood	Kelley, Pa.
Burdick	Fogarty	Kelly, N. Y.
Burleson	Forand	Keogh
Bush	Ford	Kilburn
Byrd	Forrester	Kilday
Byrne, Pa.	Frazier	Kilgore
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Kirwan
Canfield	Friedel	Kluczynski
Cannon	Gary	Knox
Carnahan	Gathings	Knutson
Cederberg	Gentry	Krueger
Celler	George	Laird
Chase	Gordon	Landrum
Chelf	Grant	Lane
Chenoweth	Gray	Lanham
Lankford	Patterson	Smith, Wis.
Latham	Pelly	Spence
LeCompte	Perkins	Springer
Lesinski	Pfost	Staggers
Long	Philbin	Steed
Lovre	Poff	Sullivan
McCarthy	Polk	Taber
McConnell	Preston	Talle
McCormack	Price	Taylor
McDowell	Prouty	Teague, Calif.
McGregor	Radwan	Teague, Tex.
McMillan	Ray	Thomas
McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, La.
Machrowicz	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, Mich.
Mack, Ill.	Reuss	
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N. J.
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Magnuson	Riehlman	Thomson, Wyo.
Mahon	Rivers	Thornberry
Mailliard	Roberts	Trimble
Marshall	Robeson, Va.	Tuck
Matthews	Robsion, Ky.	Tumulty
Meader	Rodino	Udall
Metcalf	Rogers, Colo.	Vanik
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	Van Pelt
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Velde
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.	Vinson
Miller, N. Y.	Rooney	Vorys
Mills	Rutherford	Vursell
Minshall	Sadlak	Wainwright
Morano	St. George	Walter
Moss	Saylor	Weaver
Moulder	Schenck	Westland
Multer	Scherer	Whitten
Mumma	Schwengel	Wickersham
Murray, Ill.	Scott	Widnall
Murray, Tenn.	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Natcher	Scudder	Williams, N. J.
Nelson	Seely-Brown	Williams, N. Y.
Nicholson	Selden	Willis
Norblad	Sheehan	Winstead
Norrell	Shelley	Withrow
O'Brien, Ill.	Short	Wolcott
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski	Wolverton
O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes	Wright
O'Hara, Minn.	Siler	Yates
O'Neill	Sisk	Young
Ostertag	Smith, Va.	Younger
Passman	Smith, Kans.	Zablocki
Patman	Smith, Miss.	

NAYS—26

Blitch	Jackson	Poage
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Flynt	Lipscomb	Shuford
Haley	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Mason	Utt
Holifield	O'Konski	Wilson, Calif.
Holt	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Hosmer	Pillion	

NOT VOTING—53

Andrews	Garmatz	Pilcher
Arends	Gavin	Powell
Barden	Granahan	Priest
Belcher	Hays, Ohio	Quigley
Bell	James	Rabaut
Bentley	Jenkins	Rains
Boykin	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Burnside	King, Pa.	Richards
Carrigg	Klein	Riley
Chatham	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	McIntire	Tollefson
Denton	Macdonald	Van Zandt
Dondero	Martin	Watts
Donohue	Merrow	Wharton
Eberharter	Mollohan	Wier
Fountain	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Fulton	Morrison	Zelenko
Gamble	Osmers	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Carrigg.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. James.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gamble.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, a recent issue which is entitled "Colorado Moves On."

In speaking of the fate of the bill the editorial says:

It appears the project can be brought to the House for floor debate late this month, leaving no excuse for failing to give it careful consideration and a calm vote.

One may suggest that aside from the Nation's welfare, no time should be lost for the sake of Congressman HOSMER of California. If he is given many more weeks in which to dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented, the consequences can't be foreseen.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial reflects upon my integrity as a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman send the editorial to the Chair?

Mr. HOSMER. I will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman raises a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter, including tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial being couched in the terms it is leaves a question on everything that I have ever said about this project over several long years of effort. I am going to itemize these to you and ask you: True or false? And leave it to your opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I opposed this project because it tramples the water rights of California both as to quantity and to quality. True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I stated, under date of March 16, the reason for my opposition to the upper Colorado basin project because as proposed it would qualify California's right to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation. This is my full statement:

Southern California Congressmen have been receiving numerous letters from home urging us to oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project.

For myself, as a member of the committee holding hearings on it, I wish to say that I have devoted the majority of my time to this great battle on behalf of the 6 million southern Californians vitally dependent on the quantity and quality of their lawful share of the water of the Colorado River. We vitally need it for our homes, our farms, and our job-giving industries.

If the day should ever come that Colorado River water failed to flow into our area, on that day Southern California would be changed from an oasis to a desert. On that day, every southern Californian would lose the value of his home and everything else he owns that could not be transported to another part of the country.

In addition, we must protect the almost three-fourths billion dollars we have invested in dams, canals, transmission lines, and other facilities constructed to make use of our share of the water.

All southern California Congressmen have participated wholeheartedly in this nonpartisan battle for southern California's vital interests.

The reason we oppose the upper Colorado Basin storage project is that, as proposed, it would violate California's rights to waters of the river established by compact, contract, and appropriation.

It is a strange, but true, fact that developments on the upper Colorado can proceed without interfering with California's rights.

Thus, our fight is not blindly directed against upper Colorado Basin developments in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Rather it is against carrying them on in such a way as to trample our water rights.

Whenever these States are willing, in building and operating their projects, to recognize and respect our rights, I believe California's opposition will vanish like a snowball in the hot sun.

We, in the arid West, are all interested in seeing that every possible use is made of what water we have. But we will forever "stand on our ditch" and protect what is rightfully ours.

Southern Californians can become "water vigilantes" and help in this battle. They should write their friends and relatives in other parts of the country to contact their own Congressmen and Senators urging opposition to the upper Colorado project until the legislation contains provisions guaranteeing California's existing water rights.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield. I wish to make my statement. If any time is left I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from California is not speaking to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This question of personal privilege is one of rather broad latitude.

The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield at this point.

I state further that whenever these States are able to build and operate their own projects, I believe California's opposition will vanish.

Again, on April 28, 1955, I made a similar statement and concluded it must be revamped and redesigned, referring to the upper Colorado River project, so that ultimately it will produce results, not just consequences. True or false? This is the text of the statement:

Strong opposition to the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project has been voiced to the House Interior Committee considering it by southern California's congressional delegation.

Acting as spokesman for the group, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, Long Beach, presented the committee with a 121-page statement summarizing objections and supporting them with detailed economic, engineering, and other data.

The Hosmer statement included the following points:

The project would seriously cut down the amount of water the Golden State could expect from the Colorado River.

The quality of that water would be seriously impaired by a higher concentration of salts and alkalis.

Power generated at Hoover Dam would be reduced by water shortages and to replace it, southland home and industrial consumers would have to pay over $2 million a year more for power.

Going on to general objections to the project shared by citizens of all the 48 States, HOSMER said:

Lost power revenues during the life of the present Hoover Dam contracts would cost United States taxpayers at least $187 million.

The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project would cost United States taxpayers an additional $4 billion, and $372,800,000 of that amount would be borne by California taxpayers.

The project $4 billion cost means that the price tag to irrigate each acre in the 600 square miles of farmland involved will be $5,000. Its products would involve taxpayers in further expenses when purchased as surplus under price-support programs. There is that much land in other areas of the country that can be brought into cultivation later, if needed, at a significantly smaller cost.

The project's vast hydroelectric production facilities must sell power at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the next 100 years to pay for themselves. This will be impossible because of lower cost power developing from nuclear fuels and the facilities will be left on the taxpayers' backs as the most monumental white elephant in history.

The project's Echo Park Dam will invade scenic Dinosaur National Monument with unsightly power facilities.

Utah's famed Rainbow Bridge, the world's largest and most magnificent natural structure of its kind, will be endangered by construction and operation of the project's Glen Canyon power reservoir.

The project will saddle a limited agriculture economy on the upper basin States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico whereas they have unlimited possibilities for the future if left free to develop an industrial economy.

In urging defeat of the project HOSMER concluded, "it must be revamped and redesigned so it ultimately will produce results, not just consequences."

Southern California Congressmen joining HOSMER's general opposition to the project, without specifically committing themselves to any of the particular arguments against it, were: Representative DONALD L. JACKSON,

Republican; Representative GORDON MCDONOUGH, Republican; Representative CECIL KING, Democrat; Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat; Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican; Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican; Representative JOE HOLT, Republican; Representative CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat; Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat; Representative PAT HILLINGS, Republican; Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican; Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Democrat; Representative JAMES UTT, Republican; Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican, and Representative ROBERT WILSON, Republican.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that California is not opposed to this project on the basis of any loss of low-cost power. I have merely taken the opportunity to point out that the United States Treasury will lose some $187 million in revenues from the Hoover Dam if this project is built. I have not opposed it because it will cost some $2 million more a year in power costs to southern California power users. That amounts to about $2 a family, and we can afford it. That argument is specious.

I have argued that the quality and quantity of the water that California gets will be interrupted, interfered with, and deteriorated because the overall project will store 48 million acre-feet of water, 48 million acre-feet of water that will never pass through Lee Ferry to go to southern California to serve that area, and another 10 million acre-feet that will disappear by means of evaporation. Water is one of our most precious commodities; we cannot afford such waste.

The Bureau has stated to the committee in this connection that the upper-basin States can store water for the purpose of using it 50 years hence and keep it from those who want to use it now in the lower basin, that such is a proper interpretation of the compact. That is an interpretation of the compact which is entirely strained and erroneous.

Whether you believe my statement is true or false as to the deterioration of California's water in quality and quantity, I want you to evaluate this on the statement made by Gov. Ed C. Johnson, who prabably knows more about the Colorado project than any other individual. He served in the other body for a number of years and is presently the Governor of the State of Colorado. I refer to his statement issued in December 1954 in which Governor Johnson, among other things, quoted ex-President Hoover, who was the man at the head of the Colorado River Compact Commission back in 1922. He quoted Mr. Hoover to the following effect: "The lower basin will receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes."

Governor Johnson further stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin.

There are serious misconceptions abroad concerning the terms of the Colorado River compact, according to Governor Johnson.

He says it imposes restriction on the upper basin which must be understood, as they are basic to any plan of development in the upper basin.

These basic questions are, according to Johnson:

First. Does the compact deny the upper basin the right to withhold water it cannot use for domestic and agricultural purposes?

Second. Does it deny the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power?

The answers he gives are these:

Article II (h) of the compact defines "domestic use" as for household, stock, municipal, mining and milling, industrial, and like purposes, excluding power generation.

Article III (e) says the upper-basin States shall not withhold water and the lower-basin States shall not require delivery of water which cannot reasonably be applied for domestic and agricultural uses.

Herbert Hoover was chairman of the Commission that drafted and signed the compact. He interpreted these provisions at the request of Representative Hayden, of Arizona, on January 27, 1923, before any State ratified the compact.

Asked if article III (d) meant that upper basin could withhold all except 75 million acre-feet within consecutive 10-year periods and thus secure not only III (a) water but the entire unapportioned surplus, Hoover replied:

No. Article III (a) gives the upper basin 7.5 million acre-feet per annum. III (e) says the upper-basin States cannot withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. III (f) and III (g) specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. So there is no possibility of construing III (d) as suggested.

According to Governor Johnson, when asked why article IV (b) made impounding of water for power purposes subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, Hoover said:

(a) Because that conforms to established law in most semi-arid States.

(b) Because cultivation of land outranks in importance generation of power.

(c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission that such preference was proper.

Asked if such subordination of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses would destroy Arizona's claimed ability to develop 3 million horsepower if the river continued to flow undiminished into Arizona, Hoover answered, according to Governor Johnson's statement:

Since the compact states that no water is to be withheld above that cannot be used for agriculture, the lower basin will thus receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper basin for agricultural purposes.

Governor Johnson then quoted Delph E. Carpenter, Colorado's compact commissioner who reported to the Governor of Colorado on December 15, 1922:

Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes * * * power is * * * subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin.

On March 20, 1923, Carpenter, in a letter to a Colorado Senator and Congressman, reiterated:

All power uses in both basins are made subservient to * * * agriculture and domestic * * * and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Further explaining the point, Governor Johnson said that an interpretation of the compact published January 15, 1923, W. S. Norviel, Arizona's commission said:

The fifth principle (established by the compact, is that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses.

In response to written questions, Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, on January 20, 1923, elicited the following statement from A. P. Davis, then Director of the United States Reclamation Service, according to Colorado's governor:

The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7.5 million acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all the yield of the lower basin, and that water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below.

I quote Governor Johnson directly as follows:

The foregoing official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified and were not disputed. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

Johnson added that the compact foresaw a subsequent treaty with Mexico as to that country's right to Colorado River water and spelled out just how that burden should fall on the upper and lower basins. Article III (c) provided that it was to come out of surplus to the extent possible, and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by each basin.

Then Governor Johnson made this admission:

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the Seven State Compact.

Senator HAYDEN's question No. 15 to Hoover on this point brought the reply:

The upper States shall add their share of the Mexican burden to delivery to be made at Lee Ferry. Article III (c) requires that amount to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for * * * the upper basin must furnish its half of any deficiency.

Carpenter's report to the then Governor of Colorado contained a similar statement.

Governor Johnson then adds, that if Carpenter had thought about it, he also would have said:

Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper bain.

Governor Johnson clinches it with this statement:

Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student to the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

Then he goes on to summarize what the compact does as follows:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned * * * the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an additional 1 million acre-feet per annum of surplus water (art. III (b)). However, the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7.5 million acre-feet awarded the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7.5 million acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

As to the article III (b) entitlement of lower-basin States to make beneficial use of an additional million acre-feet of water, Governor Johnson said this is to be met out of surplus water over and above article III (a) water, provided the upper States are using their 7.5 million acre-feet for agricultural and domestic purposes. Even if the upper basin stores for power, at least 1 million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this article III (b) demand.

HAYDEN questioned Hoover on this point, according to Governor Johnson, and he answered that the article III (b) water was not just to come out of tributary sources in Arizona, but was to come from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

So, Governor Johnson stated:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1.5 million acre-feet to Mexico and the 1 million acre-feet (of article III (b) water) to the lower basin; further, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Governor Johnson adds, the upper States must deliver 75 million acre-feet during each 10-year period plus 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico, total 82½ million acre-feet, before they can use any water beyond that used before the compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that would leave 3¼ million acre-feet. In the previous 10-year period it would have been 4,150,000 acre-feet. In 1902 upper basin would not have had anything under this formula.

Eight hundred eighty thousand acre-feet would be lost per year in evaporation. Colorado would be charged with 400,000 acre-feet of that loss, yet would not get one drop of water out of the storage dams. Colorado is too close to the bottom of the water barrel and cannot afford that loss, so must insist on storage projects in Colorado, according to Johnson.

The Hill report, bought and paid for by the State of Colorado, indicated about 1 million acre-feet of unappropriated water in Colorado. But it did not charge Colorado with the Mexican burden of at least 375,000 acre-feet which will jump to 750,000 acre-feet if the dams are built for storage. This plus evaporation would leave the State without any unappropriated water at all.

In connection with the statement true or false as to the reduction in California's rightful share of water, I quote the Attorney General of the State of California, Mr. Pat Brown, who states I am correct.

The following article appeared in the Los Angeles Times under date of February 24, 1956:

UPPER COLORADO BILL'S DEFEAT URGED BY BROWN—ATTORNEY GENERAL CALLS PROJECT UNNEEDED AND THREAT TO CALIFORNIA'S WATER RIGHTS

California's Democratic attorney general spoke out decisively yesterday against the billion-dollar upper Colorado River project bill now nearing a vote in the House in Washington.

The long struggle over the controversial measure has been moving toward a climax.

Attorney General Brown's statement summed up the California position and explained the opposition of this State to the measure.

"In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated," Brown said. "I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26."

ADVERSE TO STATE

"I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

"The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorada River project bill constitutes such a threat."

OTHER BASIC REASONS

"There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of new land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

"I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado project bill, at this session of Congress."

Now, if that is not enough, I want to tell you this statement that Governor Johnson made in connection with the Colorado River controversy I just quoted is based on the report of Raymond C. Hill and Associates, an engineering firm who was sufficiently able to be hired and paid for by the State of Colorado to report on their water resources. This very serious statement made by Governor Johnson I have mentioned is based on that report.

Mr. Hill was also employed by the San Diego County Water Authority to make a survey of its water resources. The San Diego County Water Authority is one of some 67 southern California agencies, cities, towns, and groups that are in the metropolitan water district that vitally depend upon the Colorado River for its water supply. This is what Mr. Hill told the San Diego County Water Authority:

When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the MWD (metropolitan water district), namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right. * * *

Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, what affects one member of the Metropolitan Water District disastrously affects all members disastrously. All 67 cities and authorities in southern California would be so affected—6 million people, a tremendous part of the economy of our country.

If I did less than to use every best effort that I have to oppose this project on the basis that I have just read to you, I would do that much less than my oath of office and my duty to the people of southern California would require.

I set forth California's reasons for opposing the upper Colorado project in a speech found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11412. During 1956, I made remarks entitled, "State of California Officially Opposes Upper Colorado—A Resolution of the State Legislature"—and "California's Opposition Based on Protection of Her Water Rights."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is not speaking on his question of personal privilege, but is speaking as to the nature of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has previously stated that in laying the foundation for answering the charge of falsehood in the editorial, the gentleman from California would have rather a broad field to discuss his reasons for defending himself. The Chair calls attention to the gentleman from California, that there are limits to the liberality extended in this connection and suggests that the gentleman from California proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand this editorial is several weeks or months old. Does the age of the editorial make any difference with the Chair in that it should have been answered more promptly and that the gentleman should have been more resourceful than to use this particular time in dealing with the editorial?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that that question has no

purpose at all in the present problem. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said that the $1.5 billion upper Colorado River storage project as approved by the Senate and an ostensibly similar House bill are one and the same thing. True or false?

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible $1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it appear palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows as can be seen from the chart I have here:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383 (substitute)
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized). By Senate, 21. By House, 24.	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects the only difference between the bills is this: the Senate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to mention Echo Park and Juniper although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry, substitutes San Miguel for Woody Creek, and adds Animas La Plata and Yellow Jacket.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective, and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these small differences about which projects to authorize now and which to come back for later.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the last 5 minutes the gentleman has made no reference to the truth or falsity of the charge that he raised under his question of personal privilege. On the contrary, he has placed before the Members of the House a chart, and from that he now proceeds to discuss the bill. It has no relation to the truth or falsity of the charge. The gentleman has refused to permit anyone to ask him any questions and proceeds to discuss this bill, so that it does not come within the definition of personal privilege, on which grounds he sought the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might state that he feels that the gentleman from California is very close to the line where the Chair may sustain a point of order. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman has the right to discuss the facts involved in the pending bill insofar as that is necessary in order for the gentleman to express his views with reference to the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, and to answer that charge, and make his record in that respect. The Chair again suggests to the gentleman from California, having in mind the observations of the Chair, particularly those just made, that he proceed in order and confine his discussion of the bill at this time only to that which is necessary to challenge the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am in a difficult position, because the editorial states merely that, "He would dream up a bigger falsehood than those he has already presented," and I can only say what I have said about the bill for the purpose of challenging that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not stopped the gentleman to date but has suggested to the gentleman that he is getting very close to the borderline where the Chair reluctantly may be constrained to sustain a point of order. I might say the Chair has been very liberal and hopes that the gentleman from California will not present arguments on the merits of the bill which are not related to meeting the charge of falsehood contained in the editorial, to a point where the Chair will feel constrained to sustain a point of order.

The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I proceed now to the point whether it is true or false, the statement that I have made that these various versions of the bill are one and the same thing, that it is actually a $1½ billion entity. I have shown you the various participating projects, and have explained to you the very minute difference in the authorizations sought in similar projects.

I now want to explain my allegation is supported by statements contained in the majority report. If the Members will turn to the report, they will find on page 6 the statement:

> The legislation recognizes that the units and projects authorized and the additional projects named for planning constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive plan for development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin and that the legislation is not intended to limit or preclude, in the future, as additional needs are indicated, authorization by the Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned to the upper basin States under the Colorado River compact.

That is why I say that this is just the initial foot in the door, camel's nose under the tent, that we are dealing with a $1½ billion entity here labeled as the upper Colorado River storage project; and that once we mire ourselves down in the beginning of it, there will be no end to expenditures that will have to be made.

I have said that the ultimate cost of this piece of legislation before the House will be $5 billion. Why have I said that? Is it true or is it false?

In order to answer that question and in order for you to evaluate the accuracy of it, I must say this: In connection with reclamation projects in general, the portion of the funds that goes to construct the irrigation phase, as distinguished from the power phases of the project, are reimbursable to the United States Government, but reimbursable without interest.

Therefore, there is a burden upon the taxpayers of the United States of the interest that accumulates on the money that the Federal Treasury borrows and has to continue borrowing during the whole period that a project pays out. That bears directly on whether or not this is a $5 billion entity or not.

Just take the projects alone that are in our bill, or take the Senate bill, which is practically the same, insofar as those projects on which this type of nonreimbursable interest would accumulate are concerned, not for 10 years, not for 20 years, not for 30, not for 40, but for 70, 80, or up to 100 years, we do not know, at 2½ percent for 10 years you accumulate an interest charge of a quarter of the principal amount borrowed. In 40 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 100 percent. In 80 years you have accumulated an amount equal to 200 percent of the original investment, and that is the reason why this type of legislation involves the taxpayers of the United States in such tremendous costs.

Just on those projects that we have in the bill, and although they are listed at $760 million in the authorization, the Bureau of Reclamation has told us they will cost $933 million, on the projects alone substantially, according to the calculations on the paybacks and the time they will take, and, parenthetically, you notice that portions of the bill talk about up to 100 years and other portions talk about up to 50 years, to pay back the accumulated interest would be $1,428 million, on a probable direct project cost, of more like $1,093 million: that would make its total cost $2,521 million. Give or take half a billion on that to accommodate it to the $933 million price tag on this bill and you still have a $2 billion project.

That is why I say that this initial phase is so extensive. If you do the same type of calculation for those projects which are listed for study and later authorization, you will find that the bill adds up to $5 billion. You get back your original investment in power, you get back your original investment in irrigation, if the thing pays out, but you are still out those tremendous sums in the payment of interest. Proponents will be coming back in later years to get the additional projects listed for study by the bill. That is why I say this will end up as a $5 billion project. I refer you to the following chart prepared at a time when the projects in the bill totaled $1,093 million, as illustrative of the hidden interest burden, together with how it is distributed among the States:

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000
		2,521,000,000		5,080,000,000	

More than that, the secondary phases of the central Utah project, and only the initial phases are provided for here, are such that in the Rules Committee one of the project's opponents admitted that the direct cost of that without interest would probably be in excess of $3 billion.

If you think that this is a falsehood with respect to the interest and its accumulated cost, the compound interest on the money that is borrowed, just let me quote to you from a letter dated March 17, 1955, to the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the other body from the Department of the Interior, signed by a man named Crosthwait, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in which he said that the project recommended by the Secretary would involve a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000. That is a lot of money, and that is why I make these charges. Here is the pertinent paragraph of the letter:

The project recommended by the Secretary would involve an interest cost to the Federal Government discounted to year 1957 of about $175 million based on the allocation to power being repaid in year 2002 and $190 million based on the final payment from the irrigation water users in year 2032. Studies show (1) that compound interest at 2.5 percent on the construction costs would be in the magnitude of $550 million which amount less credits of $15 million for interest on payments by the irrigation users would result in an interest cost in the order of $535 million, and (2) that the interest cost incurred through year 2032 and interest from year 2003 to year 2032 on the remaining balance would amount to about $1,200,000,000 which, less credits of $47 million for interest on payments of the water users, would result in a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000 in year 2032.

So that there may be no question as to how I arrived at the $933 million direct cost of the project referred to a few moments ago, let me put it this way.

Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act but not to exceed $760 million." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional $173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorized features, bringing the total sum to $933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over $1 billion.

In any event it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of $760 million the actual figure is $933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed (either is authorized by the bill) the cost would be $894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64–67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects	$304,356,300	
Glen Canyon Dam	421,270,000	
Flaming Gorge	82,942,000	
Navaho (dam and reservoir only)	49,305,000	
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet)	49,305,000	
		$894,273,300
Curecanti (modified plan)		88,500,000
		933,468,300

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project, involving a construction cost of $1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of $760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

I have mentioned before that the $760 million appropriation figure in the

bill should not mislead you when it comes to determining whether or not what I say about the cost of this bill is true.

Now that cost even at that is probably a very low one because I have taken the precaution, as I have in all my statements, to have the documentation necessary to back them up. I obtained from the second Hoover Commission a full list of the projects that have been carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation—what the Congress brought the hammer down on them for—what the Bureau of Reclamation told the Congress they would cost—and what the Congress actually ended up appropriating for them. It is a long list but you may be interested in just a few excerpts. One Colorado project was sold to the Congress for $1,300,000 and ended up costing $8.9 million.

A New Mexico project was supposed to cost $2.3 million and Congress ended up appropriating $27 million. These are direct construction costs.

A Wyoming project was supposed to cost $9.4 million and the Congress ended up appropriating $26.6 million.

A Utah project started out at $9.9 million and ended up costing the taxpayers $33.4 million.

Here is the complete chart:

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Hondo, N. Mex.	1903	[1] $359,000	$371,788
Milk River, Mont.	1903	1,000,000	9,881,774
Newlands, Nev.	1903	1,250,000	7,899,479
North Platte, Nebr.	1903	2,516,000	27,939,501
Salt River, Ariz.	1903	2,800,000	26,244,688
Uncompahgre, Colo.	1903	1,300,000	8,965,959
Bell Fourche, S. Dak.	1904	2,100,000	5,288,236
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (old)	1904	[2]	223,423
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.	1904	1,200,000	3,633,219
Minidoka, Idaho-Wyo.	1904	2,600,000	43,706,054
Shoshone, Wyo.-Mont.	1904	[1] 7,828,000	23,673,962
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.	1904	3,000,000	5,806,743
Boise, Idaho	1905	[1] 10,852,000	66,371,938
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	1905	[1] 605,000	5,800,683
Garden City, Kans.	1905	[1] 419,000	334,475
Huntley, Mont.	1905	900,000	1,552,159
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	1905	[1] 4,470,000	18,871,222
Okanogan, Wash.	1905	444,000	1,633,973
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.	1905	2,317,113	27,337,078
Strawberry Valley, Utah	1905	1,250,000	3,498,994
Umatilla, Oreg.	1905	1,000,000	5,324,457
Yakima, Wash.	1905	10,000,000	60,359,928
Sun River, Mont.	1906	7,372,000	10,059,013
Williston, N. Dak.	1906	[2]	409,095
Orland, Calif.	1907	[1] 607,000	2,564,519
Grand Valley, Colo.	1911	[1] 3,621,663	6,765,733
King Hill, Idaho	1917	527,230	1,987,854
Yuma auxiliary, Arizona	1917	[3]	2,266,487
Riverton, Wyo.	1920	9,465,000	26,626,000
Owyhee, Oreg.-Idaho	1926	17,715,000	18,998,744
Vale, Oreg.	1926	3,590,000	4,962,697
Weber River, Utah	1927	3,000,000	2,725,885
All American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.	1928	38,500,000	67,614,755
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. (Hoover Dam and powerplant)	1928	126,500,000	172,070,000
Bitter Root, Mont.	1930	750,000	1,037,087
Baker, Oreg.	1931	200,000	281,589
Burnt River, Oreg.	1935	550,000	601,026
Central Valley, Calif.	1935	170,000,000	737,774,000
Colorado Basin, Wash.	1935	487,030,228	754,476,000
Frenchtown, Mont.	1935	220,000	290,797
Humboldt, Nev.	1935	2,000,000	1,214,321
Hyrum, Utah	1935	930,000	953,854
Kendrick, Wyo.	1935	20,004,000	37,738,385
Moon Lake, Utah	1935	1,500,000	1,599,359
Ogden River, Utah	1935	3,500,000	4,735,284
Parker Dam, Ariz.-Calif. (power)	1935	21,767,000	24,201,808
Provo River, Utah	1935 [4]	9,974,000	33,452,199
Sanpete, Utah	1935	375,000	374,540
Truckee storage, Nevada-California	1935	$1,000,000	$1,092,423
Buffalo Rapids, Mont.	1937	3,055,000	5,669,336
Colorado-Big Thompson-Colo.	1937	31,702,772	164,131,000
Colorado River, Tex.	1937	20,000,000	23,961,794
Deschutes, Oreg.	1937	8,000,000	12,943,000
Gila, Ariz.	1937	19,474,000	[4] 50,083,860
Pine River, Colo.	1937	3,240,000	3,471,437
Tucumcari, N. Mex.	1937	8,278,000	[5] 15,540,011
Austin, W. C., Okla.	1938	5,600,000	12,295,102
Fort Peck, Mont.-N. Dak., (exclusive of powerplant and dam)	1938		25,400,000
Fruitgrowers Dam, Colo.	1938	200,000	200,309
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak., (WCU)	1939	1,500,000	1,238,546
Paoni, Colo.	1939	3,030,000	6,723,308
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.	1939	1,118,000	927,412
Colorado River, Ariz.-Calif.-Nev. (front work-levees)	1940	[6]	[6] 12,190,000
Eden, Wyo.	1940	2,445,000	6,152,000
Mancos, Colo.	1940	1,475,000	3,926,000
Mirage Flats, Nebr.	1940	2,560,000	3,282,588
Newton, Utah	1940	595,000	712,591
San Luis Valley, Colo. (1st unit)	1940	17,465,000	56,230,577
Davis Dam, Nev.-Ariz.-Calif.	1941	41,200,000	118,902,056
Palisades, Idaho-Wyo.	1941	24,092,000	76,601,000
Scofield, Utah	1943	640,000	943,889
Balmorhea, Tex.	1944	347,000	429,554
Hungry Horse, Mont. (power)	1944	48,319,000	102,900,000
Intake, Mont.	1944	62,000	90,530
Missoula Valley, Mont.	1944	250,000	278,762
Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1944	300,000	482,360
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1946	1,466,000	2,488,000
Arnold, Oreg.	1947	220,000	205,535
Cachuma, Calif.	1948	32,310,000	36,967,000
Ochoco, Oreg.	1948	1,500,000	849,830
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	453,000	449,554
Solano, Calif.	1948	45,577,000	47,111,000
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	1949	1,798,000	2,434,257
Grants Pass, Oreg.	1949	100,000	100,000
Weber Basin, Utah	1949	69,534,000	70,385,000
Canadian River, Tex.	1950		96,079,100
Eklutna, Alaska	1950	20,365,400	33,800,000
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1950	30,179,000	29,606,000
Vermejo, N. Mex.	1950	2,679,000	2,919,000
Collbran, Colo.	1952		17,236,000

[1] Estimated in H. Doc. 1262, 61st Cong., 3d sess., Fund for Reclamation of Arid Lands 1911.
[2] Combined cost of Williston and Buford-Trenton estimated in 1911 at $1,195,000.
[3] Included in estimate of Yuma project.
[4] Exclusive of contemplated allocation of $1,553,565 of cost of Imperial Dam herein included in All American Canal project.
[5] Exclusive of cost of storage works (Conchas Dam) constructed by Corps of Engineers.
[6] $100,000 per year.

As I have indicated on the hidden interest chart I referred to previously, if you total these direct costs and extremely extravagant hidden interest costs and apply the percentages that each of the various States of the Union contribute in taxes to support the Federal Government, you can find out how much your own State would pay.

It is true, I have said, that while this river is running through four States, it will drain 44 States, and from these charts I think you can see well why; and well see why I have consistently termed this piece of legislation the solid gold reclamation project; and have asked would it not be just as sensible for the Congress to appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as it would be to appropriate money for the upper Colorado project?

It is because I believe that this project is not sound that I am opposing it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the first point of order is that the gentleman is not permitted under the rules to refer to something said by a Member of the other body in that body, and secondly, that the gentleman from California is not referring to the truth or untruth of the allegations in the editorial when he is quoting some person such as a Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York sounds correct. Reference cannot be made to what has taken place in the other body. The gentleman from California made such reference previously, but no point of order was made. The Chair has been very liberal in permitting the gentleman from California to retain the floor because if the Chair sustains the point of order, the gentleman would lose the floor and the Chair hesitates to go that far with reference to any Member of the House who has the floor on a point of personal privilege. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from California cooperate with the Chair in trying to enable the gentleman from California to retain the floor for the remainder of his time. The gentleman from California may proceed in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have another point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chair having sustained the point of order, which has just been made, must now declare the gentleman from California has lost the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that what the gentleman said in raising the point of order was sound, but that the Chair has not yet passed on that point of order, and has recognized the gentleman from California to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly attempt to proceed in order and will expunge the remarks with reference to a Member of the other body from the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the project is not self-liquidating—true or false? Start with the $933 million which the Bureau states it will cost.

The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at 2½ percent on $993 million of original investment for the smaller project proposed is $23,325,000 per year; for the larger $1.6 billion development proposed is $40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. At page 12 of its report the Interior committee estimates for the first 50 years of the project, power revenues of $1,075,000,000 and water revenues of $36,600,000. Total $1,111,600,000, or revenues of $22,230,000 a year on the average. Obviously this is a smaller sum than the $23,325,000 annual interest. Equally obvious is that the project is bankrupt before it even starts.

As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to

pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than $1 billion for the smaller development and $4 billion for the larger development, by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

These figures I think show us that the project is obviously not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now, I next have said that the financial scheme is unsound and will burden the taxpayers for generations and generations to come. Is this true or false?

I have made certain charges underlying and supporting this. I want you to determine whether they are true or false. I have said the irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 85 percent of the cost. True or false? Here are the facts:

None of the reclamation components of the project would be financially sound themselves. The original direct irrigation investments on the 11 projects recommended by the Secretary range from $200 to nearly $800 per acre for the central Utah project—initial phase. For the Navaho project authorized by the Senate-approved bill, the original investment would be over $1,500 per acre. Including the cost of the storage units allocated to irrigation, the average direct investment—construction cost—disregarding hidden interest, would be $750 to $900 per acre, varying with the number of projects included.

As compared to these costs, the average value of already irrigated farmlands in the project area is about $150 per acre. Thus, the average investment proposed by the project would be 5 to 6 times the average value of the land after irrigation.

Of the total irrigation investment, the irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay about 15 percent. Consequently, these irrigation projects must be subsidized to the extent of about 85 percent either by power revenues or directly from the Federal Treasury by such devices as allocations for assumed flood-control benefits, fish and wildlife benefits, and so forth.

I have said project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible. True or false? Here are the facts: The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness, E. O. Larson, stated, page 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383:

> With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But 1 disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the 100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The $1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

I have said the project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years.

If my statement is to be determined true or false, we will have to see what the prospects for the power revenues are. Every single estimate and calculation that has been made as to paying off this project from power have been based on selling 6-mill power for the next 100 years. Here are the facts:

Six mills or more, the price to be charged for power generated by the hydroelectric plants in this project, is an extremely high rate for public power. There is no guaranty that the power can be sold at that rate. The bill does not require that contracts for the sale of the power be negotiated before construction begins, such as was required under the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized Hoover Dam.

It is especially doubtful that a market for 6-mill power will continue for 100 years—a full century—as contemplated by the bill. These power units will be located in a region having boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. These resources, combined with the approaching availability of atomic electric power, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in the near future, and the project will not be able to repay the Federal Treasury as scheduled, or, perhaps, at all.

We are being asked to look 100 years into the future by this newspaper that accuses me of falsehood. To consider the future, let us look back 100 years. The Civil War had not even been fought; Thomas Alva Edison was 9 years old; and electricity had not even come into use for any purpose other than an occasional bolt of lightning.

One hundred years in the future is a tremendous interval, especially in the light of present atomic development. Can you imagine how it will develop? Can you compare hydroelectric power with atomic generated power? Is it feasible to expect these revenues to come in to make the project feasible and pay out having to sell hydropower against atomic-developed power during the next 100 years? That is why I ask you to evaluate my statement as to the project's scheme of financing being wholly unsound.

Let us get into these nuclear developments. Today Congress has seriously before it a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and others, to provide actual atomic heating and lighting of the Capitol of the United States. The Shoreham Hotel downtown is determining whether or not it will install an atomic plant. So you see these developments are not speculative, they are not 100 years ahead of us, they are here today. When these installations have been made what is to become of them? Hydroelectric power can in no way be modernized and be made competitive as these developments unfold.

This project is not financially sound. If you took out the hydro part and put in nuclear power, yes, it could be modernized and made competitive, but you cannot make hydropower competitive with atomic power. That is why I say the project's financial scheme is not feasible or workable. That is why I made the following statement on the subject on March 6, 1955:

> The age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are now building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.
>
> What does this mean to conscientious legislators who must evaluate proposals to invest large sums of money in new Federal hydroelectric projects?
>
> Simply that they must look at them, not only in the light of all factors heretofore considered, but with this additional question in mind: Will nuclear power be transformed into electric energy at cheaper rates than electric energy can be obtained from water power in the foreseeable future?
>
> If the answer is "Yes," then our vast hydroelectric plants may become obsolete white elephants, giving way to more efficient nuclear-electric plants just as the horse and buggy gave way to the more efficient automobile. If this should happen, the Federal Treasury would never recover the millions it might pour into hydroelectric and related developments.
>
> With millions, and possibly billions at stake, consideration of this possibility is absolutely essential if Congress is to act with responsibility in this day of swiftly moving scientific progress.
>
> The proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado storage project is a specific instance.
>
> Bills now before the Congress call for a spending authorization ranging from $1 billion to $1.8 billion on the Upper Colorado River. They would construct numerous irrigation projects, the revenues from which could repay only 7 percent of their cost. Tied in with the bills are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations,

but also 93 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power "cash register."

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Remember, just 15 years ago, in 1940 nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commerical nuclear-electric energy generating plants are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic power stations at an estimated cost of $840,000,000. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present conventional generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of $100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1 or 2 mill current instead of 6.7 mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its full value of about $20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

That is why Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, vice chairman of the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, just a few days ago predicted that atomic experts will develop a reactor in the next 2 years that will produce power as cheaply as oil, coal, or water.

Within 5 years, he said, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course are the hydroelectric plants.

During a speech in Los Angeles on February 15, Floyd B. Odlum, financier and president of Atlas Corp., predicted that by 1975 all electricity in the United States will be generated by uranium-based powerplants. He, too, said that even at present atomic energy is practically competitive with other fuels for the generation of electric power.

Using a cubic-inch block of wood as a symbol representing a similar block of uranium-235, Odlum said that 20 such little blocks of U–235 would supply enough energy to provide New York City with all its electrical needs for a 24-hour period.

Of course, there are numerous technical difficulties yet to be overcome in the production of nuclear electricity. But the fact is they are being overcome and sometimes in the very process of building nuclear-electric facilities.

Consolidated Edison of New York, one of the Nation's leading power producers, boldly announced only a month ago that it will soon build a nuclear-electric generating plant to add to its system.

Thus the problem is facing us squarely, and we cannot dodge it in connection with the upper Colorado proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress must have their eyes open to these facts of modern-day life. There must be a clear-cut determination as to whether or not nuclear-electric energy developments will turn this proposed multibillion dollar expenditure into a dead loss. We cannot inflict such an enormous new burden on the Nation's taxpayers for several generations to come.

Therefore, Congress must hold thorough hearings on this point. It must even delay consideration of the legislation for a year or two, if need be, so that the legislation may be evaluated in the light of results of nuclear-electric energy research and development now under way.

So that the Congress may be further informed I am backing up this plea with additional information I have collected over the past few weeks.

That is why I made another statement on this subject on February 21, 1956, as follows:

Production of electric power by atomic energy is not a dream of the future. The age of nuclear power is here.

Today the United States is engaged in a vital contest with the Soviets to maintain its nuclear leadership not only in weapons, but equally in economic uses of the atom's secrets. If we fail in this, then we will fail to stem the tide of ruthless, aggressive, dictatorial communism. Such a failure would not be America's alone, but would be shared by people everywhere who look to us to preserve the peace and maintain the freedom and dignity of mankind.

Yet in the midst of this deadly struggle, Congress is being asked to waste hundreds of millions of dollars worth of our resources to build hydroelectric plants as "cash registers" for irrigating arid land at high altitudes in Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. This is a project so infeasible that its water revenues could repay less than 15 percent of its cost. It is a project that could only add to the Nation's bulging agricultural surpluses.

I refer, of course, to the "solid gold Cadillac," a multibillion dollar upper Colorado River storage boondoggle.

If political pressures are so great in an election year that Congress cannot resist this greatest hoax since P. T. Barnum invented the "egress," at least it should be carried off in a manner minimizing its drag on the Nation's vital strength in the great battle against the Communist evil.

If Congress should insist on spending billions of dollars to put arid new land under cultivation and at the same time enact a $1 billion a year program to deposit 40 million acres of farmland in soil banks, then at least in the process it should provide something of national benefit to salve the welts on United States taxpayer's backs.

This can be done if Congress firmly and courageously yanks out of the bill every cent of the $504,212,000 provided for "horse and buggy" hydroelectric plants and directs this amount of money be used to build nuclear-electric facilities.

Such a substitution has a greater value merely than giving the United States nuclear-electric program a half-billion-dollar shot in the arm to spur it toward supremacy over the Reds. The idea may well save from ruin the already shaky financial structure of the upper Colorado scheme. It is presently based on selling 6-mill power for the next hundred years. Obviously, 6-mill power will be rendered competitively obsolete in a fraction of that time by nuclear-electric developments. Starting out with nuclear power plants, they could from time to time be modernized and bring power production costs down. Starting out with hydro plants, nothing could be done to stop them from being turned into history's most monumental white elephants by swiftly unfolding technological developments.

In short, not only do common sense tactics vis-a-vis Soviet developments demand this nuclear for hydroelectric substitution, but dollars and horsesense as well demands it.

This is particularly true because there is no need for water storage behind power dams to enable the upper basin to make the new uses of 600,000 acre-feet of water annually contemplated in the bill. Over a million acre-feet of new uses can be made without such storage. The unnecessary storage provided for hydroelectric uses would permit evaporation from extensive lake surfaces of over 800,000 acre-feet of precious water annually—125 percent of the amount put to beneficial use.

In the water-short West this is an additional and compelling reason to pull out the hydro plants and put in nuclear ones.

There is no justification for building great hydroelectric dams when atomic power can be more effectively utilized.

I have also pointed to the infeasibility of the financial scheme of the project by bringing to the attention of the Members of this body another swift-moving development that has occurred within the past few months. That is exemplified by the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Weather. It is a report that shows rain making is here today and that at a cost of a million dollars a year these four States—Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico—can get more water than they need. Yet the financing of this scheme calls for no recognition of that, no competition with that kind of a financial threat to the finances of the United States Treasury. The following is the text of my recent statement on this subject:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT—WEATHER CONTROL MAKES IT A WHITE ELEPHANT

There has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more infeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather-control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist, of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20-percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conservative estimate and that the average increase

of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximately 50 percent. If the 50-percent figure were used for the upper Colorado basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—rainmaking—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly $1 billion for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about $1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover power plant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than $2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately $1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leeching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is created. It can be produced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed $1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

I have pointed out that the financial scheme of the project is unsound, and I ask you whether it is true or false when I also said that the very water rights upon which the project depends to produce its power revenues are in litigation now and may never be available for use by the power dams in this project. Why do I say that? Because the whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper-basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.

Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (e) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

ART. III (e). The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

ART. IV (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper-basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years—the minimum required by article III (d) of the compact—they may keep everything else. Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California, et al. Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

Also in that court dispute is the question whether or not some millions of acre-feet of water annually of Indian claims to water are available.

Of course, when I mentioned Governor Johnson's statement a while ago saying that the water had to be let down, then I mentioned that the Bureau of Reclamation said "No," it could be stored. Who can say that an additional court case going to the Supreme Court will not have to be fought over this water, which could be lost, and which, therefore, has a bearing on whether or not the financial scheme of this project is unsound? True or false?

Mr. Speaker, I have made several statements with respect to the project being dangerous to agriculture in this country. I have said that the project would grow crops already in surplus. True or false?

I have the word of the Bureau of Reclamation on that and they have listed the crops that will be grown on the various projects and whether or not they are surplus. From Reclamation Bureau reports a table has been compiled showing every type of crop which would be

grown on each of the 33 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops. Here is the table:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
Lyman	40,600	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grain	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Creek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

I invite your attention to what the table says and to the large number of products now in surplus that would be produced if this project is allowed to pass this House.

Further, in evaluating whether or not the statement I made that this is dangerous to agriculture is true or false, I have pointed out that for the most part only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by the project. That comes directly from the Bureau of Reclamation itself. Remember I said only marginal agricultural lands would be serviced by this project. True or false?

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under this bill, will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre on the Bureau's figures. Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than $100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

I have also said that there already exists 20 million acres of land in this country that could be put into production at considerably less than the cost of this project will require. I have said that. What are the facts? Is what I said true or false?

The Department of Agriculture settled that one when they submitted a tabulation showing there were 20 million acres of land in the humid areas of this country that could be put into production at a cost of from $60 to $100 an acre compared with the cost this project involves for its land.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States, as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

I said also that in addition to these 20 million acres there exist 21 million additional acres of land that have been in agricultural production heretofore that is not today and could be put back into production. Is that true or is it false?

Well, I got these figures by having a man go to the Soil Conservation Service itself. True, the raw figures upon the books of the Soil Conservation Service were those taken through a survey in 1944, but consistently the keepers of the books said this, that there has been some in and some out. But, land in and land out just about balance each other out. So my figures are substantially correct, and as correct as anybody can get. They total up to almost 21 million acres of idle land. So, let me say this: We have heard that new agricultural land is needed, and I have said that this project is not the way to do it. True or false?

For your information, the statement I made on this subject was as follows:

WE ALREADY HAVE AN IMMENSE SOIL BANK

The President has made a very commendable proposal to relieve the farm problem by use of soil banks. Few people know that the deposits he envisions will be additional to nearly 21 million acres of fine farmland in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States already in the bank.

These 21 million acres are good cropland now lying idle in the farms of these 19 States—States and acreage amounts tabulated below. They are not woodland or pastureland. They are good, unused farmland in soil classes I, II, and III.

The interest the Nation will be paid by the existence of these two soil banks should not be diminished by inconsistent reclamation programs, such as the upper Colorado River project, which would bring large amounts of new land into production.

If 40 million acres are to be taken out of production, as proposed by the President, and placed in a soil bank and reserve for future use, then these idle 21 million acres must be added to the total. Thus, the proposed soil bank would have deposited in it a total of more than 60 million acres.

Early last fall I began a study to determine the amount of idle cropland in certain areas of the Nation.

Specifically, the question I wanted answered was this: How much good agricultural land is unused in farms in the humid sections of the United States?

PURPOSE OF SURVEY

Evidence has indicated to me that there was a large amount of good land in eastern, southern, and midwestern farms that was not producing crops.

How much?

In line with my opposition to the proposed multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project, I considered this a matter of great significance.

The upper Colorado River project would bring into production more than half a million acres of cropland, the major part of which would produce crops of the kind already in great surplus and heavily supported by the taxpayers.

In the present session of the Congress, the problem of our mounting surpluses has priority on the legislative calendar. Congress will consider a plan for decreasing the number of acres producing crops in surplus.

Yet, while Congress is struggling to decrease the number of acres now producing agricultural products, it is being asked to approve a gigantic irrigation project that would bring more acreage into production at extremely high cost.

Data before me at the time Congress adjourned last year showed that large amounts of the acreage contained in farms was literally soil in the bank. That is, we already had a large soil reserve that might be brought into production when and if this country needed it to produce food and fiber.

My observations were begun before any specific soil-bank program was officially tendered the Congress for consideration. Now that has been done. However, I shall not dwell on the present legislation designed to curtail our agricultural production and decrease the enormous load of surpluses.

I shall report on the findings of my study of idle land in farms. These findings show us that all during the time we have been burdened with the dilemma of a mounting agricultural surplus, we already had an enormous amount of our best farmland lying completely unused.

Here, on the one hand, are millions of acres of first-class agricultural land lying idle in areas of adequate rainfall. On the other hand, legislation before Congress proposes to spend enormous amounts of public money to bring more acreage into production in such developments as the upper Colorado River project. In addition, the Reclamation Bureau is proposing an extensive program for developing hundreds of other projects, all designed to increase our agricultural production with money from the same taxpayers who are paying heavily to support crops and store them.

IDLE LAND SURVEY FINDINGS

My survey of idle land in farms showed there are nearly 21 million acres of fine farmlands now lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States.

In determining this total—precisely 20,937,153 acres—only agricultural lands in classes I, II, and III, the best farmland, was included in the survey.

The acreage tabulated was contained in privately owned farms.

Woodlands, pasture or lands owned by the Federal Government, municipalities, or school districts was not considered.

Some of the land tabulated had a history of agricultural usage, but was idle in all respects, according to the latest data available.

Official records of the United States Soil Conservation Service were the basic source of the information obtained. Permission to examine records and to confer with field officials was obtained from Soil Conservation Service headquarters.

A trained researcher visited each of the 19 States in which the survey was conducted, and at State headquarters of the Soil Conservation Service conferred with soil scientists and engineers.

Every effort was made to obtain the most factual data, and no information was included that was not approved by the Service officials.

THE STATES SURVEYED

The States in which my survey was conducted all lie in the humid section of the country, where crops depend upon rainfall, and where irrigation, if used, is supplemental. It is interesting to note that even in these sections of more or less dependable rainfall, supplemental irrigation is being used increasingly to assure annual production. Thus, in the Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern areas of the Nation, supplemental irrigation is helping to increase production and contributing to the prevention of crop failures.

The States selected for my study may be divided into three general geographic sections.

Midwestern States: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri.

Southern States: Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky.

Southeastern States: Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia.

Tabulation of idle farmland, in classes I, II, and III only, in the South, Southeast, and Midwest as obtained from the U. S. Soil Conservation Service

SOUTH

State:	*Acres*
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338

SOUTHEAST

State:	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519

Tabulation of idle farmland, in classes I, II, and III only, in the South, Southeast, and Midwest as obtained from the U. S. Soil Conservation Service—Continued

MIDWEST

State:	*Acres*
Illinois	627,135
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

CONCLUSIONS

Here is evidence to show that while Congress is being asked to approve enormous costly new irrigation projects, at least 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose.

Right now we have before us in Congress the gigantic upper Colorado River project. Unquestionably the most expensive and unsound scheme yet devised, it alone would bring into production more than half a million acres in high barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where the rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, it is proposed to force this great new burden of the upper Colorado River project on the American taxpayers.

I consider the findings of this survey nothing short of amazing. In addition to the 21 million acres of the best farmland that is now idle in 19 States there are millions of other acres in lower soil classes and in other States that are idle in the humid area of the Nation. Much of this idle lower class land could be improved with little cost and developed into pasture.

These millions of idle acres of the best lands are close to markets, to population centers, with roads and transportation running through them, and with schools and municipal governments established.

Where the multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project would be built, there is little population, few roads, no metropolitan markets, few towns. The enormous cost of establishing municipal governments, police forces, schools, building of highways and new towns must be added to the cost of developing the arid lands.

It is an unbelievable proposal for the purpose of growing more farm products of the kinds already in great surplus while there are these millions of acres of good idle land in the Midwest, South, and East.

The Bureau of Reclamation would have us believe that we must spend billions to develop projects like the upper Colorado in order to provide food and fiber for our growing population.

That simply is not true. On the presently producing farmlands we are growing so much food and fiber that we cannot find adequate space to store it. The President has asked that 40 million acres of our presently producing lands be placed in a soil bank.

Each year new methods are reported for increasing per acre yields.

Yet the Bureau of Reclamation would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars for such unnecessary and wasteful projects as that proposed in the upper Colorado Basin. This project alone would saddle a new $4 billion tax loss on the Nation's taxpayers. The four States benefiting would pay less than 2 percent of the cost. Taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance.

The cost of bringing the millions of acres of good farmland now idle into full production would run from only $15 to $150 an acre—when and if they are needed.

Compare that with the $5,000 an acre cost of building the upper Colorado project and you see how inconceivable the scheme is. Bringing into production the good lands now idle in the East, Midwest, and South would cost the taxpayers nothing. In the upper Colorado project the taxpayers would have to pay not only the excessive cost of building the irrigation projects, the roads, schools, and other necessary community projects, but then the taxpayers would have to subsidize the crops that would be grown, such as dairy products, grains and wool. The whole thing is nothing short of economic idiocy.

Well, of course, this is the fact. The fact is that with the 20 million acres that the Department of Agriculture says are available and with the 21 million acres of idle land, that is 41 million. The estimates are that by 1975 the additional needs of the country's increased population will be 100 million more acres and that 70 million of those acres will come from land capable of production, which leaves 30 million to go. Well, we have 41 million right here, so certainly my statement with respect to the agricultural effect of this project should be true.

I most urgently commend to your attention Adm. Ben Moreell's recent remarks on water policy in regard to what I have just said on the agricultural problem. Here are extracts:

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

Federal water resource policy should be related to national policy in the determination of priorities for the uses of water. In particular, Federal policy should not encourage or condone the commitment of scarce water to meet needs of marginal utility or for uneconomic purposes.

A notable example of confusion in policy is our handling of croplands. We have a total of 350 million acres now being harvested. Another 134 million acres are available on existing farms but are not being harvested, although about half are used for pasture.

Irrigated lands in cultivation total 26 million acres. But of these, less than 7 million acres are on Federal projects, the remainder, 19 million acres, having been developed by private enterprise. While the current Federal program provides for bringing more land under irrigation at costs ranging up to $1,500 per acre, the Department of Agriculture reports that 21 million acres of good cropland can be obtained by clearing and drainage works which would cost only $175 an acre. During the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, the Federal Government, under marketing quotas, removed 31 million acres from cultivation. And recently, we have learned that 40 million additional acres would be taken out of cultivation under the President's soil-bank plan.

Why should the Federal Government commit large quantities of precious water to provide increases of cropland acreage while, at the same time, it is forcing large-scale withdrawals of good lands from cultivation? Illogical allocations of water to agriculture, which is already burdened by oppressive surplus problems, will stifle industrial and urban development and will result in profligate waste. The spending of huge sums to bring more land under cultivation while the Government is paying even more money to take land out of cultivation is inexplicable—unless, of course, the primary purpose is to get rid of the money.

Now, I have also made several points with respect to the geology of this project, and you have all heard that. I said that this project should be delayed until these geological questions are settled. True or false?

Well, that, of course, is a matter of opinion and speculation, and you cannot say whether that statement of opinion is true or false. I do not think that is what the Salt Lake paper is talking about, but I do think they are talking about a statement that I made that there could well be landslides of gigantic or earthquake proportions occur in the reservoir area of the Glen Canyon Dam and thereby imperil the financial ability of this project to pay back.

A number of you have seen this chinle shale that I sent to you and have watched it disintegrate, and I have pointed out that that would be a danger. True or false?

Well, there is approximately 50 miles of it, 47 miles to be exact, in the Glen Canyon reservoir area. The Bureau of Reclamation admits to knowing only about 14 miles in this entire area. It is usually found in areas where it is formed in cliffs 400 feet high, overlain by massive sandstone rock formation, which, when undermined by disintegration of the chinle, would crash down and fill up the reservoir. This picture I have here shows some of that type of disintegration, and I just want to read you an extract in determining whether what I have said is true or not, an extract from forgotten pamphlets down in the Bureau of Reclamation by a man who investigated the area for the Geological Survey back in 1931, Prof. Herbert E. Gregory. He wrote:

[Extracts from U. S. Geological Survey publications describing Chinle]

THE KAIPAROWITS REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 164 (1931), by Herbert E. Gregory and Raymond C. Moore)

The Chinle formation includes the group of shales, "marls," thin, soft sandstones, and limestone conglomerates lying between the Shinarump conglomerate and the Wingate sandstone. * * *

Records show that the Chinle is thickest in northeastern Arizona and southwestern Utah * * * 320 to 393 feet in upper Glen Canyon, and 830 feet in the San Juan Canyon (p. 53).

A fragment of fresh rock immersed in water swells to nearly twice its bulk, and after drying is nothing more than a pile of disconnected, irregular grains; alternate drying and wetting produces a substance part of which passes through filter paper. Under the microscope, most of the material appears to be colloidal (p. 57).

When the Chinle marls and shales on steep slopes are saturated they seem to move by their own weight, carrying their broken strata and talus blocks to lower levels. At the south base of the Paria Plateau slides in the Chinle have spilled over the Shinarump conglomerate and down the Moenkopi cliffs to the Kaibab below, and at a place about 14 miles south of the Burr trail the Chinle beds have lost their hold and have slid, accompanied by huge fragments, over the upturned beds of Navaho sandstone, down the west side of the Halls Creek Valley in a jumbled mass that is roughly three-fourths of a mile wide, 1½ miles long, and 80 feet deep (p. 145).

As viewed from the rim of the Kaiparowits Plateau at Fiftymile Point the landslides are impressive. The slopes below the capping Cretaceous sandstone constitute a field about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long, everywhere strewn with boulders, the largest of which are square blocks of sandstone 40 feet thick. Successive slides have banked the materials in huge ridges like a series of terminal and lateral moraines.

Except in areas of Chinle and Tropic shales landslides were not observed. The steep slopes of other formations are bare or coated with only ribbons and scattered patches of debris (p. 146).

THE SAN JUAN REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 188 (1938), by Herbert E. Gregory)

The position of the relatively soft Chinle between two cliff makers accounts for its preservation in a region where erosion is vigorous (p. 49).

In the Chinle formation the conditions for producing slides are exceptionally favorable. The thin sandstone beds readily break into talus fragments, and the marl beds when saturated seem to move by their own weight. * * * Instability is further shown by mud flows that after heavy rainfall issue from the base of slides. In places recurrent movement is indicated by the arrangement of material in parallel ridges on Chinle slopes and by unconformities in the piles of debris successively pushed over cliffs (p. 102).

Note particularly Professor Gregory's description of a Chinle landside 2 miles wide and 10 miles long. Well, 10 miles of land sliding down into a narrow reservoir is to my mind a landslide of earthquake proportions. The following is the statement I made respecting the Chinle question:

GLEN CANYON RESERVOIR PERILED BY CHINLE FORMATIONS

Gigantic landslides were pictured as possibly devastating the $421 million Glen Canyon dam and reservoir, key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project, by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, today.

Fifty miles of the immense walls of the long, narrow reservoir site are comprised of rock so soft that it swells to nearly twice its size and disintegrates when touched by water, HOSMER declared. The reservoir would extend 186 miles along the Colorado River and 70 miles along the San Juan River.

The soft rock—known as Chinle shale—forms immense cliffs in numerous areas that would be covered by water impounded by the proposed 700-foot high Glen Canyon dam. The dam, known as the "cash register" of the upper Colorado project now before Congress, was designed to produce power revenues to pay off some 30 other units of the project that cannot pay for themselves.

HOSMER stated that he had been advised by independent geologists that the reservoir's water would swiftly disintegrate the Chinle shale, and it would flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks, HOSMER said. All of the broken debris, the Congressman explained, including blocks of sandstone as big as houses, would move downslope and partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in the extensive areas of Chinle shale.

"If this is permitted to happen," said HOSMER, "the finances of the entire upper Colorado River project would collapse with it.

"The Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion-dollar mud puddle.

"Congress should withhold any consideration of the legislation pending a full and complete geological survey and report of the site."

HOSMER's sensational charges were based on a personal investigation he made of the

reservoir area last December in the company of two independent consulting geologists. The expedition was made by helicopter to remote sections of the reservoir site in northern Arizona and southern Utah. Several hundred pounds of the Chinle shale were gathered and flown out for laboratory tests.

Using samples of the Chinle rock he obtained in Glen Canyon, HOSMER demonstrated the rapidity with which it turns to mud when placed in an ashtray containing a small amount of water.

"I am presenting to Congress reports of the distinguished geologists who accompanied me to Glen Canyon," HOSMER said. "These reports show that if this Chinle shale is brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir it would immediately disintegrate and flow down slope into the reservoir.

"Obviously, with evidence such as this, obtained from unimpeachable sources, the least that can be said is that there are sound reasons why Congress should not approve this immense investment of public money."

HOSMER said that the geological investigation and the collection of rock samples was done by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists.

He stated that landslides which could occur would be of unbelievable size to anyone except a geologist. Much of the Chinle shale, now dry, supports several hundred feet of overlying Wingate and Navaho sandstone which would collapse into the reservoir when the Chinle disintegrated in water.

"The size of the landslides which could occur may be pictured by considering the fact that the Chinle itself has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, for instance. On top of the Chinle are the great cliff-forming sandstones.

"The whole upper Colorado River project would cost the taxpayers more than $4 billion, and it would be entirely unworkable without Glen Canyon to produce power revenues," HOSMER said.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this. I want to know if the provisions of this bill are broad enough to provide that every citizen of southern California might have a handful of rainmaking pellets. In southern California you have a situation where there are more clouds for rainmaking and they are confined closer than any place in the country. It is the only place I know of where with a handful of pellets you can sow clouds at arm's length and cause it to rain on your feet while your head remains perfectly dry.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, that is not much of a parliamentary inquiry, but I hope the gentleman is happy that he has made some kind of a point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who answered that parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. I have also said that there is a great possibility that this Glen Canyon Reservoir would never hold water even if the dam were built. True or false? Again, that is a statement of opinion, but let us see whether the facts I have stated with regard to it are true or false.

I have said that there exist in the area of the reservoir gigantic geological downwarps. These are simply the ground formations swinging down into little valleys and going underground.

I have said that this area is Navaho sandstone. I do not think there is any question about that. I point to the existence of these downwarps. I have had the Geological Survey draw a map showing them so there would not be any question about their existence, if you are going to believe the Geological Survey.

I have also said that this Navaho sandstone has a porosity of 22 percent. That was admitted at the hearing.

I have also said that it is quite possible that these tremendous downwarps which have such a vast capacity might be dry and therefore drain off any water that started to be impounded behind the reservoir. The following is the complete text of my statement on this subject:

GREATEST ENGINEERING BLUNDER IN OUR HISTORY

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, said today that gigantic Glen Canyon Dam, $421 million main unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project, could become the "greatest engineering blunder in our history," because water for the project would pour into two enormous subterranean sieve-like basins, instead of flowing through the dam to make hydroelectric power.

"Alongside of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir are two underground basins of almost unbelievable size. Once the 700-foot high dam was built across the Colorado River, the flow of water could back up and pour into these immense sieves," HOSMER stated.

"One of these great subbasements of the earth is known as the Kaiparowits Basin. It would hold at least 250 million acre-feet of water. The other is the Henry Mountains Basin, and it would hold 100 million acre-feet of river water. (Note: An acre-foot of water is enough water to cover 1 acre of ground a foot deep.)

"That is 350 million acre-feet of water, or at least 26 years' flow of the whole Colorado River at this point.

"If adequate power cannot be produced by the dam to pay its cost, it hardly seems reasonable to build it and force this great new loss on the taxpayers of the Nation."

HOSMER said that scientific data in his hands make it doubtful that Glen Canyon Reservoir could be filled "in our lifetime," and doubtful as well that adequate power could be produced by the dam.

"This matter demands an exhaustive investigation by independent geologists and engineers who have no personal interest in the project," HOSMER declared.

The Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains basins would hold enough water to cover the District of Columbia to a depth of 8,000 feet.

That is enough water to serve the people of New York City for 98,000 days, or 268 years.

"Here, based on sound geological reports, we have the frightening spectacle of the whole Colorado River flowing for years into gigantic underground sponges," said HOSMER.

"The great dam that is proposed here would stand as a towering monument to engineering folly and a memorial to the wanton waste of all these millions.

"These endless cellars are immediately adjacent to the reservoir site and are 2,000 feet in depth below the river. There are miles and miles of rock of great porosity through which the river water would flow away, to be forever lost to use in the cavernous depths of the earth.

"This rock is marked by enormous cracks and fissures which I have observed myself as late as last December. Water backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam could have free flowing passage into them and into the great basin through them. Undoubtedly many of these cracks and fissures occurred during the gigantic geologic earth movements that created these tremendous downwarps.

"Such a loss would be a major tragedy. In addition to the great money loss to all taxpayers, the entire economy of most of the West would be irreparably damaged. This in turn would effect the welfare of the entire Nation."

HOSMER said that last December, in the company of geologists Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, he made an examination of the Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir area in northern Arizona and southern Utah. The country contains no roads, and the trip was made by helicopter. Sample of Navaho sandstone and Chinle shale rock were brought out from the reservoir site.

HOSMER quoted from a report submitted to him by Dr. Hoots as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure."

HOSMER emphasized that the Bureau of Reclamation has reported favorably on the proposed upper Colorado River project and its chief unit, Glen Canyon Dam, without adequate information as to the practicability of the project, without proper engineering studies, and without determining the immensity of water losses that would occur.

In House Document No. 364 of the 83d Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation's explanation of the project, a startling admission is made as to water losses of an unexplained nature in the San Juan Basin, into which the reservoir's waters would extend and which is crossed by the Henry Mountains downwarp.

HOSMER quoted the following from the document (p. 180):

"Unexplained losses of water have been reported also in the San Juan River Basin. The proposed study in the vicinity of the Navaho Reservoir is for the purpose of evaluating this loss, and determining the quantities that are lost by evaporation and transpiration."

In connection with these structural basins, House Document No. 364 adds (pp. 180–181):

"There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir."

HOSMER stated: "I most emphatically agree with Dr. Hoots and other eminent geologists and engineers that the Glen Canyon reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. This is evident from statements made by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

"Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the

topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies."

I have not just dreamed up those figures, taken them out of the thin air and as to whether they are true or false, I want you to look at the record that I am going to include with my remarks. This is in a report of a Ph. D. geologist who probably knows more about rocks and downwarps and leakage than any of us here do. He says that it will go in there, if those things are not now full of water. This is Hoots' statement:

MEMORANDUM ON GEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED GLEN CANYON DAM SITE AND RESERVOIR AREA IN NORTHERN ARIZONA AND SOUTHEASTERN UTAH

(By Harold W. Hoots, consulting geologist, Los Angeles, Calif., December 29, 1955)

The writer was requested by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER to undertake a geological investigation of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site at Mile 15 on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, and the proposed reservoir area located principally in southeastern Utah and extending 186 river miles up the Colorado River from Mile 15, and 71 miles up the San Juan River.

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation was threefold, namely:

(1) To inspect in the field critical geological aspects of the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and reservoir area, and to collect rock samples considered essential to this investigation;

(2) To review: (a) existing conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the proposed dam site; and (b) published geological data pertinent to the proposed dam site and reservoir area, for the purpose of appraising the adequacy of geological investigations that preceded the recommendation of this construction project; and

(3) To ascertain from tests by qualified engineering laboratories certain critical physical properties of rocks exposed at the proposed Glen Canyon dam site and in the reservoir area.

PROCEDURE

Field work

The geological investigation and collection of rock samples in the field was done by Harold W. Hoots and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists, December 12–14, 1955. Transportation by helicopter made it possible not only to inspect the geology of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir area from the air, but also to land at strategic localities for the examination of rock outcrops and the collection of rock samples along both the Colorado River and the San Juan River.

Several hundred pounds of rock samples were collected, flown out by helicopter, and shipped for laboratory determination of certain physical properties of the Navaho sandstone and the Chinle shale. Samples of water from the Colorado River and the San Juan River also were collected for use in conducting laboratory tests on rock samples under conditions that would approach actual field conditions within the proposed reservoir area.

Photographs were taken to illustrate the erosional characteristics of rock formations critical to the proposed reservoir area, and to emphasize the difficulty and tremendous expense involved in constructing a dam that would adequately protect Rainbow Bridge from destruction by the proposed reservoir.

Laboratory tests of rock samples

The more important of the laboratory tests were directed toward:

(1) Determination of the permeability and porosity of the Navaho sandstone which forms the walls of the Canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

These tests were made with water from the Colorado and San Juan Rivers, and were designed to duplicate, insofar as possible, conditions that would exist within the proposed reservoir. Their purpose was to determine: (a) the ability of this Navaho sandstone to absorb water from the reservoir; (b) the capacity of the pore-spaces within a unit volume of this sandstone; (c) the total quantity of reservoir that could be lost by leakage through the sandstone walls of the proposed reservoir, and thence by natural gravity drainage into the large structural basins known to extend from the Colorado River for many miles to the north; (d) the magnitude of the leakage that might occur around the abutments of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam at mile 14; and (e) whether Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be protected from flooding by a dam built in this sandstone.

(2) Determination of the physical characteristics of the Chinle shale which outcrops, and would be covered by water, along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

The purpose of these tests was to determine the ability of the Chinle shale to maintain its position and physical strength when saturated with water, and, under these conditions, to support the load of several hundred feet of overlying cliff-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstone, and to thus prevent the ultimate loss of much of the calculated capacity of the proposed reservoir.

Office studies and preparation of this memorandum

Critical review of available information bearing directly on investigations of, and recommendations made for, the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir was essential to this investigation and the preparation of this memorandum. Particular attention has been devoted to (1) published and mimeographed reports by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey on the geology and ground water of the area containing the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir area; (2) to the adequacy of the investigations made by the Bureau of Reclamation of the physical character of the Navaho sandstone at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site, and to the extent that the Chinle shale in the reservoir area will increase sedimentation and reduce the storage capacity and usefulness of the reservoir; and (3) the problems and expense involved in the construction of a dam designed to protect the Rainbow Bridge, and the uncertainty that such a dam would actually provide this protection.

FINDINGS

The Navaho Sandstone

The canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir is composed entirely of Navaho sandstone. This sandstone, as it occurs in this region, is described by Dr. Herbert E. Gregory and Dr. Raymond C. Moore[1] as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone is essentially an aggregate of white, crystal-clear quartz grains, loosely held together with cement. * * * In general the cement is weak. Even where iron oxide forms the bond, it is not easy to obtain a well-trimmed hand specimen, and much of the rock exposed at the surface is so friable that it crushes under the foot, and a single blow of the hammer may reduce a block of sandstone to a mass of dust. Blasting this rock with powder presents special difficulties."

J. W. Harshbarger, C. A. Repenning, and J. T. Callahan[2] of the United States Geological Survey, make the following statement regarding the Navaho sandstone:

"One striking feature of this sandstone is its great permeability and capacity to absorb, immediately, a substantial portion of the light precipitation. Evidence of this rapid absorption is the extremely small amount of runoff from the area of outcrop. * * * Undoubtedly the Navaho sandstone transmits water more freely than any other water bearer in the region."

Laboratory tests of porosity and permeability

Samples of Navaho sandstone collected from the lower part of the canyon wall at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam were determined to have a porosity varying from 24.3 percent to 25.5 percent, and an average porosity of 25 percent. One acre-foot of this sandstone thus has sufficient porosity to contain one-fourth of one acre foot of water.

The permeabilities of these samples of Navaho sandstone to air were found to be uniformly high, to vary from 4,920 to 5,180 millidarcys, and to average 5,060 millidarcys. Their permeabilities to Colorado River water under normal vertical hydrostatic gradient for 100 hours averaged, at the end of this 100-hour period, 1,330 millidarcys. Permeabilities of this magnitude permit comparatively rapid movement of water into and through the Navaho sandstone.

Significance of established porosity and permeability: The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure. Several such areas of lower pressure adjoin the proposed reservoir and are tabulated below:

1. The sandstone walls of the canyon adjacent to the proposed dam and the lower end of the proposed reservoir: Average permeability of this sandstone indicates that in excess of 15 million gallons of water may leak around the abutments of the proposed dam every day.

2. The Kaiparowits downwarp or structural basin: This geologic feature, one of the major structural basins of this region, extends from the lower part of the proposed reservoir northwestward for 70 miles. (See accompanying map of A. A. Baker of United States Geological Survey). It is a magnificent natural basin for containing water in volume many times that calculated for the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Access of water to this basin from the proposed reservoir is provided by porous and permeable Navaho sandstone walls along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir immediately above the proposed dam. This basin covers over 1,700 square miles and has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 250 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir is full. Since this capacity is about 10 times that calculated for storage in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir, it is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

3. The Henry Mountains basin: This geologic feature crosses the Colorado River about 45 river miles above the mouth of the

[1] The Kaiparowits Region, U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 164, pp. 65 and 66, 1931.

[2] The Navaho Country, Arizona-Utah-New Mexico, included in the Physical and Economic Foundation of Natural Resources, p. 121, by Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress, 1952.

San Juan River. It is similar to the Kaiparowits basin in its geologic character and ability to drain water from the proposed reservoir. It has ready access to the reservoir through permeable Navaho sandstone walls along many river miles of the proposed reservoir, and it has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 100 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon reservoir is full. It is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

4. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument: This area, it is proposed, is to be protected from flooding by a dam built in the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone, but regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subjected to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir through the Navaho sandstone.

The Chinle shale

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

The Chinle shale is a fine-textured, bentonitic-type rock that varies in color from gray to blue, red, and purple. When exposed to the elements it has little resistance to erosion, and when brought in contact with water it expands and rapidly disintegrates to a shapeless mass of mud.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow downslope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move downslope and would partially or completely fill the proposed reservoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Field and laboratory investigations of the character, distribution, thickness, and geological relations of the Chinle shale strongly indicate that this formation, if brought in contact with water in the proposed reservoir, would contribute materially to rapid diminution of the capacity and usefulness of the reservoir for water storage.

The Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser [3] this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

LACK OF ADEQUATE INFORMATION

It is essential that the expenditure of money required for the proposed Glen Canyon Dam project be supported and justified by adequate data, and expert appraisal and interpretation of these data. Published statements by the United States Geological Survey emphasize the fact that a vast quantity of data essential to a technical evaluation of the soundness of this project has not been obtained.

The following quotations of statements by the United States Geological Survey are taken from pages 178-182 of House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, entitled "Colorado Storage Project."

[3] The San Juan Canyon, U. S. Geological Survey water supply paper 533, fig. 2, p. 34, 1924.

Page 178, second paragraph: "Although much information on water resources of the upper Colorado River basin already has been collected, available records fall far short of presenting the complete understanding of water resources which will be needed for purposes of the storage plan outlined in this report, and for full utilization of the waters allocated to the respective States under the terms of the upper Colorado River basin compact. Detailed geologic maps and data for the upper Colorado River basin are inadequate, and in large areas they are entirely lacking. The topographic mapping essential for inventory of both water resources and mineral resources is likewise far from adequate. Only 11 percent of the basin is adequately mapped, and mapping is in progress in an additional 2 percent of the area."

Special erosion and sedimentation studies, page 179, first and second paragraphs):

"The Colorado River has always been outstanding in sediment transportation, and has been cited as a horrible example of land erosion and soil wastage by many writers. The sediment has been a vexing problem in the preparation of the storage project." * * *

"* * * Far more research is needed before reliable predictions can be made as to sedimentation in the future, and before evaluation can be made of proposed preventive measures. * * * A complete analysis of the problem will involve study also of meteorological aspects, as well as soils and vegetative cover—that is, coordination of effort among the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, and agencies of the Department of Agriculture."

Special water-loss studies—page 179, last paragraph: "In the case of Glen Canyon, it has been estimated that evaporation losses would average about 63 inches annually, of which 54 inches would be chargeable to the basin. These estimates are based on very meager data as to evaporation from free water surfaces, and transfers of data from remote areas in the case of natural losses from the stream. Detailed investigations have not been made of evaporation from streams in the basin under varying conditions of turbulence, or of evapotranspiration from riparian vegetation or from flood plains bordering the streams."

Glen Canyon Reservoir and vicinity, Arizona and Utah, page 180, last paragraph, and page 181, first and second paragraphs:

"Topographic mapping of more than 2,600 square miles has a high priority for the Glen Canyon project. Geologic mapping of a slightly smaller area along the Colorado and San Juan Rivers is proposed. The rocks cropping out in the reservoir area are predominantly sandstone, as shown by geologic reconnaissance. It is known that structural basins lie northwest of the reservoir site under the Kaiparowitz Plateau and also under the Henry Mountains. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amount of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir. * * *

"The Glen Canyon Reservoir will extend upstream into Cataract Canyon, where gypsum and salt of the Paradox formation crop out near the river level in several places. The possible effect of these rocks upon the quality of water in the reservoir should be investigated."

Classification of Federal Lands for Water Development, page 182, first paragraph: "The Geological Survey is responsible for classification of Federal lands as to their water-storage and water-power values. These values are dependent in part upon the upper basin's ability to furnish water to the lower basin as required by compact, and dependent therefore upon the Colorado River storage project. Many of the streams in the basin are not adequately mapped, and geological investigations of possible dam sites must precede any classification as to their water-power or water-storage value."

CONCLUSIONS

The Glen Canyon Reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. It is evident from the above quoted statements by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of (1) the magnitude and rapidity of water-loss that can be expected from the proposed reservoir into the large Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains' Basins; (2) the extent to which the disintegration of water-soaked Chinle shale and other similar formations will reduce the capacity and usefulness of the proposed reservoir; and (3) how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassable terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this National Monument from flooding.

HAROLD W. HOOTS,
Consulting Geologist.

And if you go to House Document No. 364, which is the basic document on this matter, you will find that the Bureau itself admitted that they did not know whether these downwarps are dry, wet, or in what state they were. My statement above contains excerpts from this document.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, for whom I have a very high regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for an inquiry on the question of personal privilege? The Chair will state that the inquiry has to be confined to the question of personal privilege. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas for that purpose?

Mr. HOSMER. I thought I was yielding for a question. I do not wish to yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question the gentleman asks must relate to the question of personal privilege.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to frame a question under

that definition. I shall be glad to ask my question and if the Chair thinks it is not pertinent, I shall withdraw it.

The gentleman has made a very careful study of this project and he has given us some valuable information. I wanted simply to ask whether in the course of his investigation he has found anything good in the project. I ask that seriously. I have not made up my mind. I want to hear both sides. I have no interest in this measure but almost everything has something good in it and I want to find out frankly from the gentleman if there was any phase of this project that had any merit, in his opinion.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may propound a parliamentary inquiry, may I answer that question and still be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may use his own judgment and the Chair will pass on the question, if the gentleman answers it, as to whether it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HOSMER. I shall merely say yes, that I have. Because I have also said about the project that there is a great amount of uranium it will cover up and that will be in it, and we will be losing a valuable resource, a great amount of uranium deposits. True or false?

I have here a letter from a geological consultant, not from Los Angeles, not from Riverside, Pasadena, or Cucamonga, but from the heart of Utah, a town named Moab. In evaluating whether or not my statement is true or false, I want you to hear what he says:

GEOLOGICAL CONSULTANT SERVICE,
Moab, Utah, February 1, 1956.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
United States Representative, California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading your protest of the construction of the dam under the proposed Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, in the Salt Lake Tribune dated January 31, I would like to commend you on your stand.

However, as a geological consultant with over 3 years' experience in uranium, and associated minerals, of the Colorado Plateau in general and with the Glen Canyon area in particular; perhaps you have overlooked a most vital reason for objecting to the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

No mention was made of the uranium deposits, now so vital to our national defense and national economy, which would be buried under millions of tons of water and which could never be recovered if the Glen Canyon area was flooded by the Colorado River storage project.

I have recently completed a comprehensive geological examination and report on the Glen Canyon area for several large uranium companies. This examination required approximately 4 months of detailed field study of the area in question, and consisted of both aerial reconnaissance and exhaustive field investigations. During this time I flew Glen Canyon and the canyons of the San Juan in a chartered super cub for the purpose of mapping detailed structural and sedimentary geology. I flew in and along the canyons for a distance of approximately 100 miles. Outcrops of considerable importance were noted on the map and were subsequently re-visited by use of a jeep and by foot. During this period I flew for 3 days giving adequate time for this examination.

Several trips into the area required camping and long stays as it is quite far from the nearest settlements. During these trips I examined numerous Chinle-Shinarump sandstone lenses and paleo-stream channels which are one of the most important guides to the discovery of uranium deposits on the Colorado Plateau. Enclosed you will find several pictures taken during the examination, containing notes on the reverse side, regarding their importance and location. If the Colorado River storage project is completed and a dam constructed, it is probable that all of the pictured area, in addition to a great proportion of the area examined, will be inundated and rendered useless to the Nation.

For example, the Whilwind Mine located in section 2, T 41 S, R 13 E, has produced over 1,000 tons of uranium ores. It is probable the waters backed up by the dam will flood the Whilwind property and parts of Copper Canyon, Nokai Canyon, and most important Oljetoh Wash, wherein is located some of the best uranium mines on the Colorado Plauteau. Also, Industriol Uranium Corp. has just recently blocked out an estimated 125,000 tons of uranium ore. Other major deposits situated in Oljetoh Wash are the Mitten-Skyline, Koley-Black, and several other interests too numerous to mention.

The Chinle formation in the area which probably would be covered by water possesses a great potential of uranium reserves, and that any destruction will be of considerable detriment to our national defense and economy; therefore, in the best interest of the Nation I would like to voice my support in your stand.

Sincerely,
GEORGE R. GRANDBOUCHE,
Geological Consultant.

Mr. DIES. That answers my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOSMER. As a matter of fact, there has been a persistent difficulty in getting geological information out of the Bureau of Reclamation concerning this project.

Secretary McKay himself exuded doubts about the geologic capability of Glen Canyon to support a 700-foot dam; doubts which I have expressed and to which the Salt Lake paper may have been referring. Here is the statement I made on the subject:

PLANS FOR HUGE UPPER COLORADO DAM UNCERTAIN, SAYS SECRETARY MCKAY

Proponents of the upper Colorado storage project are asking Congress to authorize an appropriation of $421 million for a gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz., without knowing whether the rock foundations at the site would support the immense structure as it would have to be built to integrate with other overall features of the project.

This amazing fact was disclosed in a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club.

Glen Canyon is on the Colorado River, and the proposed dam would be a key structure designed to raise power revenues to help pay for the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project (H. R. 270) now before Congress.

In his letter, Secretary McKay stated that the materials on which the dam would stand are "poorly cemented and relatively weak * * * in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams." The Secretary also revealed that "experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful."

Further, although the Bureau has presented preliminary plans for a 700-foot dam, it does not intend to present final specifications for it until after Congress has approved the present vague project.

On this subject, Secretary McKay wrote Brower:

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction."

Despite this situation, great pressure is on Congress to approve the project. After that is done the Reclamation Bureau would conduct studies to determine what size and type of dam can be built. In other words, Congress is being asked to approve spending this great sum of Federal money when Reclamation Bureau engineers themselves don't know what the final plans and designs may be, how big the dam would be, how much it would cost, how much power revenues it would bring, and when there are grave doubts that such a structure would be secure.

Thus, Congress is being asked to buy a "pig in a poke."

The Secretary's disclosures refute a 1950 report of the Reclamation Bureau which stated that the rock at the dam site "is remarkably free of structural defects."

This 1950 report also said: "The Glen Canyon site is geologically favorable for a high concrete dam."

Secretary McKay told Brower:

"Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam."

It has been the custom of the Reclamation Bureau to secure authorization of a project based on a cost estimate which they assure Congress will be ample. However, it is rarely found that these cost estimates prove sufficient. Actual costs of projects usually have been 50 to 100 percent greater than the estimates made at the time of authorization.

The obvious result has been that the Bureau's assurances of economic and financial feasibility have collapsed.

The financial plan for the whole upper Colorado River project sets up Glen Canyon Dam as the "cash register" for the development.

Yet, the Reclamation Bureau apparently does not yet know how much Glen Canyon Dam would cost or how much revenue it can be expected to produce.

In the face of these uncertainties Congress should not approve this project.

The full text of Secretary McKay's letter follows:

"Mr. DAVID R. BROWER,
"Executive Director, Sierra Club,
"San Francisco, Calif.

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed

Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time.

"On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or more feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

"Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

After hearing the following testimony during subcommittee hearings:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 243, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 10, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Have you done any work upstream from this site? (Glen Canyon Dam site.)

Mr. DEXHEIMER (Commissioner of Reclamation). Nothing but geological exploration, of course, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What is that—surface exploration?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Largely.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far back up the stream from the proposed dam site would the reservoir extend?

Mr. LARSON. 186 miles up the Colorado and 71 miles up the San Juan. I mentioned it in my statement.

Mr. HOSMER. Then you have taken visual surface geology in those extensive areas only?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. I am sure that our geologists have covered that reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. Well, surface geology?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. You were in the office 6 years. Do you know of any of the results of that work?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. It has been some time since I went over the geologist's reports, and I am not familiar enough now to say that I remember just what they were. But those reports, of course, were fundamental to the selection of this site and the reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. You cannot tell us what is in them at the present time?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. No, I cannot.

I wrote the subcommittee chairman as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1955.

Re Upper Colorado Basin storage project hearings

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommitee, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: During the questioning of Interior Department witnesses on March 10 it became apparent that those present had no geological information of pertinence to the subcommittee in evaluating the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and its accompanying reservoir. In response to my questions it was admitted that such information was in the possession of the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Commissioner Dexheimer nevertheless testified in his opening statement (on p. 2) that the geology at Glen Canyon Dam site would be a matter of discussion.

It is therefore respectfully requested that when the Bureau witnesses return for further questioning that they be accompanied by someone fully conversant with the geology at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir site so that questioning with respect to same may be carried on.

If this be impractical from any standpoint, including the fact that such questioning may involve a considerable amount of the subcommittee's time, then alternatively it is requested that specially designated members, including myself, be authorized to hold special hearings in Denver on the question at a mutually convenient time.

The reason for this request is that doubts have been expressed as to the suitability of geological formations at the proposed location for the intended purposes. The magnitude of the proposed investment of public funds thereat would seem to make it mandatory that these doubts be resolved.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

(Copies to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation.)

A geologist was produced subsequently who testified, in part, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF PAGE 362, PART I, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, APRIL 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Now, I believe the proposed lake would extend about 190 miles up the Colorado River.

Mr. MURDOCK (J. Neil Murdock, regional geologist, Bureau of Reclamation). Approximately that. River miles.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far up the other river?

Mr. MURDOCK. Sixty-one miles, approximately.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the San Juan River?

Mr. MURDOCK. The San Juan River.

Mr. HOSMER. During all this time, are you in the Navaho sandstone formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. No, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What else do you get into?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you go up the Colorado River and you get into the older shales, Triassic shales, and into the limestones.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; you get into the Kayenta formation and the Triassic formations, too.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. It is more permeable than the Navaho sandstone; is it?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; all the formations are more permeable in that area than the Navaho.

Mr. HOSMER. It is a less homogeneous formation than the Navaho; is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. It contains some sand and some gravel?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the permeability of this formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Very low. We did not make any tests on it. But it is very tight.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures whatsoever?

Mr. MURDOCK. No.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures for the Triassic (which includes Chinle)?

Mr. MURDOCK. No laboratory figures, but shale formations are recognized as impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. That is not altogether true, is it, Mr. Murdock?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you might find exceptions, but in the oil business they utilize this, because the shales are impermeable and they trap the oil in the sands.

Mr. HOSMER. That is true with a subsurface formation, but I am talking about a formation that is fairly close to the surface.

Mr. MURDOCK. Surface formation has nothing to do with the permeability of the shale. It breaks down into a clay, which again is impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. Depending upon its extent of saturation at the time you measured it; is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I don't think saturation has anything to do with permeability.

That Triassic about which he testified, including as it does the Chinle shale, which most of you saw disintegrate in water before your eyes, I believe lends credence to what I may say about the geology of the project which may be in conflict with the Bureau of Reclamation's statements upon which the Salt Lake paper appears to rely.

I have also said Rainbow Bridge could be endangered by the project. True or false? Here are the facts taken from a statement, in part, by Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., consulting geologist made December 29, 1955:

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of: * * * how the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassible terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this national monument from flooding.

I want you to determine whether this is true or false. I have said that you can no more take this Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado projects than

you can abolish history by tearing out the page in the book that it is written upon.

I have carefully documented that allegation in a statement I released on February 15 of this year citing 17 instances in the record of the hearings before the committee on this bill, the first of which was by Mr. Ralph Tudor, then an official; I think he was Reclamation Commissioner. When asked about taking out Echo Park he said:

I might say it would be like taking the pistons out of an engine. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted.

Here is my full statement:

TO SAVE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MUST KILL ENTIRE UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Representative CRAIG HOSMER said today he was informed that supporters of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument were planning to take the dam "temporarily out of the upper Colorado River project bill as a subterfuge to secure approval of the controversial project by the House."

"Probably never before in our history has such a storm of public protest been created against a power project as that which is now raging against the plan to build a large dam and reservoir at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument," HOSMER said.

"So intensive has been the opposition to it from every part of the Nation that I understand the project's proponents are contemplating arrangements under which they would appear to be removing Echo Park Dam from the bill," he added.

The dam is a key unit of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project in Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

"On January 18, 1954, Ralph A. Tudor, then Under Secretary of the Interior, testified before the House Interior Committee that Echo Park is a necessary part of the upper Colorado project," HOSMER stated. Mr. Tudor was questioned by Representative CLAIR ENGLE as follows:

"Mr. ENGLE. In order to get something constructive done for the upper basin, it might be more intelligent to take Echo Park out and proceed with less controversial features, and perhaps explore Echo Park and its alternates a little further. That is why I ask if taking Echo Park out would be like taking the engine out of an automobile.

"Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of an automobile, then?

"Mr. TUDOR. I might say, like taking the pistons out * * *

"Mr. TUDOR (later). We definitely feel that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

HOSMER declared:

"Removal of Echo Park Dam from the bill under such circumstances would be at the most a subterfuge. The action would do no more than accomplish the temporary deletion of the national monument dam from the project measure.

"The only result would be that if the bill went to conference, even next year or later, the project's proponents would come back and say: Give us the pistons for our engine * * * give us Echo Park * * * the thing will not work without it.

"Reasons for the Echo Park removal strategy are plain.

"The upper Colorado River project has already passed the Senate in S. 500. Echo Park Dam is in that bill. An amendment to remove it was defeated on the Senate floor.

"The vigorous efforts of opponents of the project, who fear that the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument would open the door to further intrusion upon the sanctity of our national parks, fell before the strength of Senators from the States of the upper Colorado River Basin * * * Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona."

HOSMER pointed out that the supporters of the upper Colorado project "realize that strong opposition to Echo Park Dam would come from many Members of the House, should the bill reach the floor."

HOSMER added:

"Thus, the project's advocates have formulated strategy under which they would remove Echo Park Dam temporarily from the bill while it is in the House Interior Committee. This would be done for the purpose of getting the bill * * * minus Echo Park * * * before the whole House. With the controversial dam temporarily out of the bill, the proponents feel they have a better chance of securing passage by the House."

HOSMER asked:

"What would happen if that occurred?

"The Senate and House bills would be sent to a conference committee assigned to reconcile differences and submit to both bodies a conference report.

"It would be naive to presume that the Senate, in the face of the previous powerful support for the project containing Echo Park Dam, would reverse itself and accept a bill with Echo Park removed.

"It would be as naive to presume that a bill without Echo Park Dam in it would be reported by the conference committee.

"Should Echo Park Dam be removed by the House Interior Committee, and should such a bill pass the House, it is a foregone conclusion that the conference committee would restore Echo Park."

Striking the printed words "Echo Park Dam" from the bill cannot strike Echo Park Dam out of the project any more than "tearing a page out of a history book can abolish the history that was recorded there," HOSMER said.

"But this is the strategy of illusion which proponents of the project are now formulating in the hope of circumventing the vigorous opposition which has been engendered by Americans who wish to prevent spoliation of our national playgrounds," HOSMER continued.

He declared there were good reasons to fear that the building of Echo Park Dam would create a precedent, and there were many other good reasons for opposing the dam.

"In addition to the objectionable site, Echo Park Dam is an unsound project," HOSMER stated. "The financial structure on which it is proposed is so weak that it could not stand alone. In order to repay its cost, the dam must be supported by revenues from another power dam at Glen Canyon. Neither Glen Canyon nor Echo Park Dams store water which would be used for irrigation in the upper basin. They are designed solely for the purpose of supplying power which would be sold, perhaps, to pay for the reclamation units of the project. The latter could not pay for themselves. Without heavy subsidization they could not be constructed. The power rates at both Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams have been set at artificial levels, and there are grave doubts that this power could be purchased by consumers because of this high price.

"Echo Park Dam would ruin Dinosaur National Monument. It would flood some of the deepest, most spectacular and colorful canyons in the country. Well may the question be asked: If the boundaries of one national monument can be opened to the Bureau of Reclamation for power dams and immense reservoirs, why couldn't all national monuments be opened? There are statutes to prevent such a thing, but it is apparent that the Reclamation Bureau does not choose to abide by the statutes in the case of Dinosaur National Monument."

He charged that there have been previous efforts to invade our national parks and monuments, and said there are excellent power sites in Yellowstone, Glacier, and many other sanctuaries set aside for the enjoyment and edification of this and future generations.

"The effort to build Echo Park Dam might well be looked upon as a dinosaur-foot-in-the-door move," he declared, adding:

"You may be certain that as of the very moment the upper Colorado River project might be authorized without Echo Park Dam, the project's proponents would start their program of nibbling to get it back.

"If they did not succeed in restoring it in conference, time would build continuously stronger arguments for their cause.

"You can almost hear them saying: Billions of the taxpayers' money have been spent to build the upper Colorado project. The only way to get the money back is to build Echo Park Dam. Give us the pistons for our engine. That is the only way we can make it work financially.

"I suggest to my colleagues and to all others who are opposed to Echo Park Dam, either for reasons of economics or conservation, that its removal from the bill under present conditions would be nothing more than a subterfuge to secure its ultimate approval by Congress.

"To stop the building of Echo Park Dam it is necessary to kill the entire upper Colorado River project."

I also made a statement on the same subject June 6, 1955, as follows:

AN ENGINE WITHOUT PISTONS

(News release from Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The supporters of the gigantic upper Colorado River project admit that in its present form it is "an engine without pistons."

Yet they are asking Congress to pass this incredible bill, and force the Nation's taxpayers to suffer a loss of more than $4 billion.

The "pistons" of the upper Colorado project was Echo Park Dam. Conservationists throughout the country fought Echo Park Dam because it would flood a part of Dinosaur National Monument.

Facing certain defeat, the bill's supporters finally informed the conservationists that Echo Park Dam would be taken out. The conservationists accepted this promise and withdrew their opposition.

It is apparent from the record that the conservationists have walked into a trap.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and numerous individuals have testified repeatedly that Echo Park Dam is absolutely vital to the feasibility of the upper Colorado River project.

For instance, on January 18, 1954, Under Secretary of Interior Ralph A. Tudor, testified before the House Interior Committee as follows:

"Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile, then?

"Mr. TUDOR. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted."

There is nothing in the world to prevent Congress from returning Echo Park Dam to the bill. If the bill can be passed without its pistons, obviously it will not work, and the pistons will have to be put into the engine.

By withdrawing their opposition to the bill, the conservationists are permitting themselves to be deceived. They are being

lulled to sleep, and they will wake up some morning to find that Echo Park Dam is to be built in Dinosaur National Monument.

The record before Congress is replete with unqualified statements by Reclamation Bureau officials and others that Echo Park must be in the project or the project will not work, cannot pay out, and would fail to provide the development desired.

Here are excerpts from that record:

Mr. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior: "1. With respect to the need for the Echo Park Reservoir, our recommendations remain unchanged. We still recommend the construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir."

Mrs. PFOST: "2. In your opinion, are there other sites that would be as beneficial to the project as Echo Park?

Mr. Aandahl: "No; I think Echo Park is way out ahead"——

Mrs. PFOST: "There is no other substitute?"

Mr. Aandahl: "It is way out ahead of alternates that might be proposed."

Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation: "3. The proposed use of the canyon sections of the Dinosaur National Monument for water and power developments was contemplated long before the original 80-acre area was enlarged to its present size of over 200,000 acres in 1938. A number of powersite withdrawals prior to that year are evidence of this fact. Recognition of the importance of these potential power developments was given in the President's proclamation enlarging the 80-acre monument. The supervision of the area by the National Park Service under this proclamation was not to affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and administration of the monument was subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

"The plan before you for coordinating the development of the water and power resources of Green and Yampa River Canyons along with their scenic and recreation values is therefore consistent with the language and spirit of the proclamation. The Department has no doubts as to the appropriateness of creating an artificial lake and adjoining facilities within the bounds of this particular national monument. It would not create a precedent for invasion of other parks. The precedent, if any, was created in 1938 when the boundaries were extended to the canyon areas with a clear understanding that water conservation and power development had prior right to the use of those areas."

Mrs. PFOST: "4. Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "Yes. Although, by elimination of parts of the project, the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin."

Mr. Dexheimer: "5. It (Echo Park) is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan."

Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation: "6. Here are the principal advantages of including Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado storage project plan:

"1. With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

"2. Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored in Echo Park would be less than any other major storage site in the upper basin.

"3. Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 200,000 acre-feet of evaporation losses annually, a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

"4. Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating the flows of the rivers, that is, when they are constructed. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River. This is why Under Secretary Tudor mentioned that Echo Park was the wheelhorse in the upper basin.

"5. The use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economical development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to upstream power markets of the proposed system of dams and powerplants and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer, chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many other important minerals."

Mr. Sisk: "7. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Merriell: Do you feel that Echo Park represents a more important feature of this project, let us say, than Glen Canyon, assuming that only a portion of the project could be built?"

Mr. Frank C. Merriell, chief engineer of the Colorado River Water Conservation District: "In some ways it does. In the first place, where this project will sell power, the first places are in the vicinity of Salt Lake and of Denver, and the most direct transmission that can be devised in the project is from Echo Park to each of those places. Now, that is the principal reason, and there are other collateral reasons. There is a possibility of a very great industrial use right close to Echo Park in the phosphate beds of the Uinta Mountains, and other possibilities in the Uinta Mountains, in the Grand Valley, in industrial use, whereas Glen Canyon is a long ways from there."

Briant H. Stringham, Vernal, Utah: "8. Opponents of the project, most of whom are well intentioned citizens, base their chief argument on the false premise that the building of Echo Park Dam within the Dinosaur National Monument will set a precedent for the commercial invasion of all parks and monuments. This argument is not based on facts as the following official documents will show. These instruments also prove that it was definitely understood by officials and the people at the time the monument was enlarged that power and reclamation projects were to be constructed inside the monument at some future time, and that the area would be subject to several other existing rights.

"On June 10, 1920, the Federal Water Power Act was passed creating the Federal Power Commission. This Commission was given authority to grant licenses to construct dams in national monuments according to the opinion given by Councilor Abbott representing the House Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation. However, on March 3, 1921, the Congress amended the Federal Water Power Act taking from the Power Commission and giving to the Congress authority to grant licenses to construct dams within parks and monuments, but in doing so, the Congress added these significant amendments: 'As now constituted or existing,' thus leaving the authority in the Federal Power Commission to grant licenses for construction of power dams in newly created monuments such as Dinosaur. President Roosevelt recognized this fact in his proclamation enlarging the monument."

Mr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of interstate streams for Utah: 9. "Mr. Chairman, I think the Echo Park Dam is absolutely necessary to this project. The Echo Park Dam, in my opinion, occupies the same position that I would, for example. I am pretty good with both arms and both legs. You can cut one arm off and I can still live, and you can cut two arms off and I can still live, and you can cut both legs off and I can still live, but I am not much good. And Echo Park Dam is an essential unit in this thing because it is a basinwide project, and it must be considered in terms of the series of storage dams, their operation to provide for water for consumptive use, provide the water to meet the obligation to the lower basin, and to provide for power generation. All of those three are inextricably tied together."

Mr. Dixon: "10. You concur in his testimony that there is no substitute equal to Echo Park as a dam site."

Mr. Clyde: "Yes, sir; I am convinced in my independent analysis as well as review of many, many reports, that there is no substitute for Echo Park."

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a United States Senator from the State of Wyoming:

"11. So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States."

Milward L. Simpson, Governor of Wyoming: "12. Echo and Glen Canyon Dams are vital elements in the development of the upper basin States."

H. T. Person, dean of engineering, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.: "13. In regard to Echo Park Reservoir—this unit is one of the very important units in the team of storage units necessary for the fullest development of the water resources of the upper basin. Its strategic location below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, its low evaporation losses and its contribution to maximum power production makes it an essential unit in the upper basin development. The grandeur, the spiritual and esthetic values of the canyons of the Echo Dam site are acknowledged. The Echo Park Reservoir will not destroy these values. Echo Park will eliminate some sections of river rapids—but there are hundreds of miles of river rapids in the vast areas of the upper Colorado River basin. Echo Park Reservoir will make the recreational values of this vast area available to hundreds of thousands of people every year—rather than to just those few hundred daredevil river runners who now have that opportunity. Echo Park Reservoir is in the Dinosaur National Monument. However, the evidence is documentary and clear, that the people of the area were given assurance in 1938 when Dinosaur Monument was extended to include the Echo Park area, that establishment of the extensive monument would not interfere with the use of the area for grazing, or with the development of the water resources of the area."

G. E. Untermann, director, Utah Field House of Natural History, Vernal, Utah: "14. Much of the opposition of rabid conservation groups to a proposed dam in Dinosaur National Monument is baseless and unrealistic."

Herbert F. Smart, Salt Lake City, Utah: "15. Conservationists opposed to the construction of this dam say there is a principle involved. Yet actually the only principle involved is one of the integrity of the Government and the people, including conservationists, in keeping promises and assurances, and abiding by conditions incident to the enlargement of the Dinosaur National Monument. The question of the inviolability of a national monument is not at issue here. The question of the inviolability of promises

incident to the enlargement of the boundaries is involved. The integrity of our national park system is predicated upon good faith, and conservationists interested in preserving the inviolability of our national park system should be the first to recognize and, in good faith, insist upon compliance with the conditions under which the Dinosaur Monument boundaries were extended, namely, subject to power and reclamation withdrawals.

"To many of us who have been a part of the conservation movement in the West, we are at a loss to understand the motives of conservationists opposing a project which will result in such a material gain to conservation objectives and principles. In the best tradition of Gifford Pinchot, the passage of the Colorado River storage project will mean the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest period of time."

Angus McDonald, legislative assistant, National Farmers Union: 16. Sites other than those recommended by the Department of Interior have been suggested because it was contended that the building of a dam at the Echo Park site would be an invasion of the national park system and would forever mar the natural beauty of the area. The record will show that the original monument created by President Wilson consisted of 80 acres which would not include Echo Park and when President Roosevelt expanded the monument by Executive Order in 1938, that he provided that expansion of the monument should not bar the building of power projects. In other words, the Echo Park site has never been part of the national park system. The mere fact that it was called a park did not make it a national park. It is also contended that development of the water resources of the upper Colorado and the Echo Park site would impair it as a recreational center and that in some way it would disrupt the Dinosaur Monument. Geography indicates that the bones of the dinosaurs, if any, would not be disturbed because the dinosaur graveyard is down the river from the Echo Park site. Impounding water behind the Echo Park would not submerge a single dinosaur bone. On the contrary the proponents of the project tell us that the creation of a huge lake behind the Echo Park would enhance the recreational opportunities and that roads would be built into the area so that many more thousands of people could enjoy recreational activities, whereas at the present time, the area is relatively inaccessible."

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a United States Senator from the State of Utah: "17. This puts the shoe on the other foot. It is not a national monument that is being invaded—it is a matter of some misled or misinformed conservationists who are trying to urge that Uncle Sam violate his integrity and treat as mere scraps of paper solemn reservations in the public interest in the Dinosaur Monument area that precede the limited monument proclamation by 17 to 34 years. It ill-behooves honest conservationists to take such an untenable position, because we who love our parks and monuments should strive to preserve as honorable and legal commitments the reservations of public lands for such a noble and worthy use as parks and monuments. Therefore, how can we, in the same breath, ask that equally binding and legal reservations for water development, be invaded, especially when the monument proclamation itself recognizes and exempts from the Dinosaur Monument land reservation these previous withdrawals for water resource development?"

REFERENCE INDEX TO QUOTED STATEMENTS

Colorado River storage project: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3383, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

PART I

Name	Date	Page
1. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G	Mar. 9, 1955	32
2. Aandahl, Hon. Fred G	do	38
3. Dexheimer, W. A	do	51
4. Dexheimer, W. A	do	174
5. Dexheimer, W. A	Mar. 10, 1955	193
6. Larson, E. O	do	193-194

PART II

Name	Date	Page
7. Merriell, Frank C	Mar. 11, 1955	471
8. Stringham, Briant H	Mar. 14, 1955	551-552
9. Clyde, George D	do	559
10. Clyde, George D	do	571
11. O'Mahoney, Hon. Joseph C	Mar. 16, 1955	615
12. Simpson, Milward L	do	619
13. Person, H. T	do	623
14. Untermann, G. E	do	650
15. Smart, Herbert F	do	683-684
16. McDonald, Angus	do	703
17. Watkins, Hon. Arthur V	do	706

Now, true or false, what I say about Echo Park still being in the bill. If you do not put it in they are going to have to come back and ask for it later. The project is not going to be financially feasible without it, so if the project is not financially feasible without Echo it certainly must still be in it, sooner or later, so the issue is actually before the Congress of the United States now, whether we like it or not.

I reiterate what I said in that regard by quoting the same newspaper that wrote the editorial about me. Last year when the Echo Park Dam was taken out of the project by the House they said:

It has long been a part of the upper basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope it will be restored.

I do not think it will be restored by the other body, during conference this year, if we pass the bill, but I do believe it will be restored as time goes on and it becomes obvious that the project cannot work without it.

I want you now to determine whether or not this is true or false: I have said that the assistance to the Navahos in the bill is negligible. I think that even the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will agree with me on that, because he said that was true when the bill was being discussed by the Republican policy committee. The bill would only build a Navaho dam and reservoir. It would be nothing more than a piece of concrete in the middle of a river, and when built it would be an item to point out and say, "Now, give us the money to do the rest of the job."

What is the rest of the job? The rest of the job is to build the project down to the Navaho Indians, which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs admitted would cost $200,000 each for 1,100 Indian farms.

The assistance to Navaho Indians in the bill is negligible; cost of project's benefits is $200,000 for each and every Navaho farm: the assistance to the Navaho Indians in the bill would be negligible without the addition of the costly Navaho reclamation project.

The bill would authorize the Navaho Dam and Reservoir only and this does not irrigate any Navaho lands. The water stored in the reservoir could not be used for irrigation of Indian lands unless and until canals and other facilities of an additional reclamation project are authorized and built, involving a construction cost of $175 million or more.

According to testimony presented at the hearings, the Indian Bureau contemplates that the additional reclamation project would provide for 1,100 Navaho Indian family farms. The cost per family farm would be about $200,000. Indian Bureau witnesses estimate the gross income per family farm would be $5,000 a year. In comparison, it should be noted that the $200,000 of capital proposed to be expended per family farm would, if invested at 5 percent interest, yield an income of twice the estimated gross farm income.

In view of these facts, consideration might well be given to some different program for use of Federal funds to rehabilitate the Navaho Indians that would be more beneficial to them and more practicable and effective from the standpoint of the Federal Government than the costly irrigation project as proposed. In this connection, the record indicates that it is not certain that the Navaho Indians either want to farm irrigated lands, or would succeed as irrigation farmers.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I will not yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman is taking this time as a subterfuge to discuss the bill. When he asked us to determine whether something was true or false I asked him to yield so I could show him it was false, and he declined to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair feels that the gentleman has for the last few minutes been proceeding in order. The gentleman is recognized to proceed in order.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the Speaker.

I want to return now to a matter that I asked you to determine in your own minds whether my statement is true or false, and that was the statement that I made that this piece of legislation would take away water to which California has existing rights by contract, by compact, and by appropriation. True or false?

A football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just one year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from

flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream in violation of the Colorado River compact and never reach them.

All this is true because the overall multi-billion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper-basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower-basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that her share of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these 7 States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper-basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrous package to which they have affixed the euphonious label, upper Colorado River storage project.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans. Plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the metropolitan water district's vast Colorado River aqueduct, with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile, the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

> The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificence to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

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

Mr. HOSMER. For what purpose does the gentleman ask me to yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. For the purpose of restating the position which the gentleman says the Governor of Colorado took.

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield at this time. If I have a little time later on, I will yield.

The upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

Placed in the best light, according to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter two power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon and one at Fleming; another, conditionally at Curecanti. Other power projects would follow later.

The Glen Canyon and other power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $500 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11

participating projects to the upper basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48 million acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10 million acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I Food Administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First, the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah;

Second, the lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada; and

Third, that part of the River which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion beneficial consumptive use of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of use of water in the amount of 7½ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet, and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of surplus water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c) saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This, again, was to come out of surplus, but if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1½ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17½ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost 2½ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one-party suicide pact California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower basin negotiator insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

> The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

That the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project would euchre California out of vast quantities of Colorado River water to which she is legally entitled should be well known and understood.

An additional specific objection to the project must not be ignored by Congress:

It threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalies and salts before use in homes and factories. Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject. Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

The reasons why southern California's water quality would suffer are simple: First, water returning to the river after new upstream irrigation uses would contain added impurities dissolved from the soil. Second, pure upstream water diverted in large amounts through mountains and out of the river system forever would not be available to dilute concentrated impurities further downstream. Third, water withheld in upstream storage reservoirs would likewise be for dilution purposes.

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre. Just how long soil could continue growing crops in face of this is speculative.

The effect would be similar in home and industrial water systems, to say nothing of the already irritated digestive tracts of almost 6 million southern Californians.

At the same time, and for the remaining life of the power contracts at Hoover Dam—until 1987—the Federal Government, and thus the United States taxpayers, would lose a total of $187 million in revenue from power not sold because there was no water to generate it.

This $187 million loss to taxpayers illustrates that there are substantial reasons not to build the upper Colorado River storage project in addition to those local to California. These reasons, shared by the citizens of all the 48 States, are varied and compelling.

Many people throughout the country find the project objectionable because Echo Park, one of the major power features of the overall development, lies in the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. They point out that a precedent would be set for the invasion of

any and all national parks and monuments by unsightly power facilities in disregard of the trust imposed on each generation of Americans to preserve these public shrines unviolated for future generations.

Naturalists also point to the possible destruction of, or at least damage to, Utah's famed Rainbow Natural Bridge during construction and operations at the Glen Canyon power site.

In their turn, taxpayers groups and economists attack the project's effect on Federal finances from several fronts.

Raymond Moley, one of ex-President Roosevelt's brain trust, has stated that by the time compound interest for 50 to 100 years is paid on the $1 billion the United States must borrow to construct the project, costs will run to not less than $4 billion. Even simple interest at 2½ percent amounts in 10 years to 25 percent of the money borrowed; in 40 years to 100 percent; and in 80 years to 200 percent.

Moley's figures indicate the total cost would amount to more than $5,000 per irrigated acre. So poor is most of the land, located as it is at high elevations where growing seasons are short, that even after irrigation its value will average only about $150 an acre.

In all, about 600 square miles would be irrigated to produce surplus crops involving further losses to taxpayers when purchased under price-support programs. Even if needed, certainly there lies somewhere within the borders of the entire United States another 600 square miles of land that could be brought under cultivation at a cost significantly less than $4 billion.

Project proponents point out that the Government can expect to recoup part of its outlay by selling electricity from power features. However, their calculations are based on selling power for 6 mills per kilowatt hour for the next 75 or more years. This anticipation is utterly unrealistic because production cost of electricity from both conventional and nuclear fuels is plummiting. With these costs at far below 6 mills in the foreseeable future, the net effect will be to leave the project's vast hydroelectric facility on the backs of Federal taxpayers as the most monumental white elephant in history.

There is a further fundamental concern pointed to by economists which must be faced both by the Nation and the people living in the upper basin who are even more directly involved. It is that the region is unbelievably rich in natural resources: coal, oil, natural gas, oil shale, uranium, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, phosphate, and many other minerals.

The resources utilized toward development of an unlimited industrial economy, not a limited farm economy, are the real keys to the area's future and to its full contribution to the American way of life.

Water resources in the area are of measurable quantity and their potential benefits in an agricultural economy not great. On the other hand, the benefits which they can bring in a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable.

Should not this region, and must not the Nation, insist that the course of development be pursued which is to the greatest good of all?

It is clear that Californians must oppose the upper basin storage project to protect the quantity and quality of their Colorado River water supply and to protect an important source of their electric power.

It is equally clear that all other Americans should join in this opposition for protection of the Nation's finances and in pursuance of a sound national policy to develop each part of our homeland to its own, and to the country's highest good.

The whole upper Colorado project must be revamped to the end that it ultimately will produce results instead of merely consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend in my remarks additional material and try, as I was not able to do today, to place these remarks in a more orderly fashion, but in stating them and in reading them I will say what I have said, and I will say why I have said what I have said, and I will leave it up to you as to whether my statements are true or false.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has not had permission to extend his remarks, and I am rather prone to object to his extending his remarks unless he has already obtained it.

Mr. HOSMER. I have already obtained that permission.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is material he desires to place in the RECORD that has not been spoken in his presentation of the question of personal privilege explaining the position he has taken. It would seem that the Members of the House ought to have the right to know something about the extent of it.

Mr. HOSMER. I will be glad to tell the gentleman what I am going to put in by way of extension. The only reason I am not talking about it now, of course, is that my time has almost expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does it represent the pile of papers the gentleman has before him on the desk?

Mr. HOSMER. I will include many of the things in these papers before me.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has it already been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HOSMER. No; if the gentleman will permit I will tell him what some of this material I have here is, or so much as time allows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOSMER. I am going to put in further material as to the costliness of this project, material further substantiating the statement I have made in that regard.

I am going to put in substantiating material showing that the cost estimated by the Bureau backstopped by the statement in the appropriation authorization in the bill of only $760 million is misleading.

I am going to put in a table showing the distribution of costs amongst the 48 States, and also as to the true cost of the tremendous interest that will have to be paid.

I am going to extend and show why I have said that the huge hidden subsidy to these four States is unwarranted and unconscionable.

I am going to put in additional material to prove my allegation that the project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am going to put in additional material to backstop my allegation that the financial scheme of the project is wholly unsound, that the project payment provisions are unrealistic, uneconomical, and unfeasible.

I am going to extend additional material with respect to the impossibility of selling power at 6 mills for the next 100 years.

I am going to put in additional material to show why I make the statement that the dams are nothing but subsidized irrigation projects and are not for power.

I am going to put in a rather full discussion of the statement that low-cost nuclear electric power development potentialities have been disregarded and neglected in connection with this piece of legislation; and in that connection I am going to quote W. Kenneth Davis, the Director of the Division of Reactor Development of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, who in the presentation to the United Nations 10th anniversary celebration in San Francisco last June stated that the most important point in considering this question is that we have a changed situation in the matter of power development; that any answer which may be given today will almost surely be changed because of the rapid progress that is being made in this new field. This is Mr. Davis' statement:

EXTRACT FROM REMARKS PREPARED BY W. KENNETH DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF REACTOR DEVELOPMENTS, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FOR PRESENTATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS 10TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE WEEK ACTIVITIES SYMPOSIUM ON ATOMIC PEACE—HORIZON OF HOPE, JUNE 24, 1955, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Where do we stand today in the technical development of nuclear power for the generation of electricity or for other power uses?

A most important point in considering this question is the rapid change of the situation with time. An answer which can be given today will almost surely be out of date a year or two from now because of the rapid progress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Mexico rise?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point of order that the gentleman now clearly shows that he is proposing to put in the RECORD not matter on the question of personal privilege, but merely debate on this bill, and that he is taking advantage of the committee by subterfuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is answering a question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska. Whether or not he puts it in is a matter for the House to determine. His having already obtained con-

sent to his request it is a matter for the gentleman as a Member to consider.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, a further point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman's request was to extend his remarks dealing with the substance of his discussion of the question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California is now offering to put in the RECORD things that are entirely not in order but which constitute debate on the bill. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has already obtained permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, the Chair assumes the gentleman is not going to trespass upon the judgment or the conscience of any other Member.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have said the project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential. True or false. Here are the facts:

The region in which the project would be constructed is unbelievably rich in natural resources. These are the measures of its future potential.

The water resources of the area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture would be small. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies could bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable and of unlimited value.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water. The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amount to about $5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.

The potential thermal power resources of the project area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of this land, the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing a horse-and-buggy economy that would cripple forever opportunities to create a profitable and unlimited industrial economy.

Steam or nuclear plants to provide electrical energy in these States could be built by private capital, with no Federal subsidy involved. They would create new employment in the coalfields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the avaliable power. Thus a sound stone would be placed in the area's economy by each plant and each job created, and the plants, the new industries, and those employed by them, would pay taxes to the local, State, and Federal Governments.

Agricultural development will seriously injure, if not kill, all opportunities to build such a sound economy. There is only so much water, and the most wasteful way to use it would be by subsidizing unneeded, extravagant, and wasteful irrigation projects. The hope of the area lies in a modern-age industrial program, not a surplus-ridden farm economy.

I have said the benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. True or false? Here are the facts:

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects, which are both economically and financially infeasible; first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits; while, second, at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: on one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only $2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are $41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find $638,500 of indirect benefits and $313,100 of public benefits to add to the finding of $614,500 in direct benefits—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The indirect benefits category includes such nebulous factors as the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers, while the public benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy.

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

I call particular attention to what has been said about this cost-benefit ratio by Adm. Ben Moreell as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH BY ADM. BEN MOREELL, NATIONAL WATER POLICY CONFERENCE, ST. LOUIS, 1956

A third area of divergence covers the requirements and criteria for determining economic justification and financial feasibility of projects, including the kinds of benefits and costs to be considered. Under present law, economic criteria are few and indefinitely described. There are no definitions of "benefits" and the interpretation of what constitutes "costs" varies fr.m agency to agency. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has even prescribed a factor to apply to attendance at the movies as a measure of project benefits. Such painful efforts to justify projects of dubious worth give rise to the suspicion that there has developed in this country a conviction that the expenditure of Federal funds to promote the interests of a particular area, or of a particular group, is warranted provided it can be shown that the probable resulting benefits to that area or groups may exceed the out-of-pocket costs which are paid for by the general taxpayers. It is almost traditional that benefits are overestimated and costs underestimated. The question whether this is the best expenditure of Federal funds in the interest of all of the people of the Nation, who pay the bill, has been given little consideration.

I have said that 50 years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project. True or false? Here are the facts:

Example 1: Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill: (a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years; (b) the municipal water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit; (c) the irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law. Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2: Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3: Present law requires interest at "not less than" 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4: Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill, the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an economic feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

I have said the project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report. True or false? Here are the facts:

The Hoover Commission report has just been released. The bill ignores any of the counsel to be gained from the

labors of the Commission, which has completed a detailed study of this entire complex field. In fact, the proponents of this gigantic scheme tried to get it through Congress before the Hoover Commission made its report, so blind have they been to the true national welfare in connection with water resources.

However, one may disagree with some of the recommendations of the Commission and the task force, your minority submits that the members of this group should be heard before Congress commits itself to the billion-dollar precedents of this bill. It should not be forgotten that this Commission was established by Congress to report to Congress so that Congress might consider the advisability of legislation to implement some if not all of the Commission recommendations. Regardless of the jeers heard from spokesmen for special interests, your minority considers that the people of this country respect the industry and the sincerity of the Hoover Commission inquiries.

Your minority believes that the people are entitled to and will demand a thorough consideration of the Commission reports in every field. For example, in the water-resources field, the Commission report relates five conditions which the task force found to be necessary for the success of reclamation projects:

First. They must have technical feasibility.

Second. They must be sound financially.

Third. They must have fertile soil capable of agricultural production over long periods of years.

Fourth. They must have adequate and suitable water supply.

Fifth. There must be farmers available who are interested in and enthusiastic for irrigation agriculture.

Relating these to the project before Congress, the record shows there is question as to the technical feasibility of the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam; the financing is wholly unsound; the soil by and large is of dubious quality; and the water supply is actively in ligitation in the Supreme Court.

The Commission further found experience shows that the farmers alone cannot bear the whole cost of irrigation projects. Conceding this, would it not be a proper inquiry for Congress to determine what the farmers should pay? Should they pay only 12 percent, as this bill allows? If so, who should bear the balance of the cost, local area residents or the taxpayer in every corner of this Nation?

The Hoover Commission makes a pertinent suggestion on this score—that the beneficiaries—including States—contribute at least 50 percent—which may well be forgotten if the hydroheaded monster now before Congress becomes law.

I have said the project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial survey prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete. True or false? Here are the facts:

The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate.

The provisions of the Senate bill itself, which require further studies and report by the Secretary of the Interior on economic feasibility and financial reimbursability of the 11 participating projects previously recommended by the Secretary, demonstrate that reliable information is not now available even on those projects that the Bureau has already reported on. The House bill seeks to cover up this deficiency even in the face of the clear recommendation of the administration that these projects be reevaluated before authorization.

The Senate bill with which the House bill might go to conference includes authorization of scores of projects on which no reports have as yet been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, on many of which only the barest reconnaissance data are now available.

The record reveals the need for much more thorough investigations and studies of the proposed storage units. Even as to the Glen Canyon storage unit, the Interior Department officials have expressed concern over the adequacy of the foundations and have stated that decisions as to final plans would not be made until further studies are completed after authorization. Plans for the other storage dams are even less decisive. Thus there is grave question as to the adequacy of cost estimates and the financial feasibility of the storage features of the project.

In addition, it is clear from the record of the hearings that the proposed storage units of the project will not supply any water to the reclamation components now proposed and are not needed to enable these projects to obtain and use the amount of water estimated by the Bureau to be required. Yet under the House bill, it is proposed to spend about $600 million, and under the Senate bill about $750 million, for storage units that are not to be needed to meet basic water-supply requirements for at least 25 years and probably more.

In view of the foregoing, action on the project at this time would be premature and without justification.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 11]

Andrews	Burdick	Dondero
Barrett	Bush	Eberharter
Bell	Carrigg	Fountain
Bolling	Celler	Fulton
Boykin	Chatham	Gamble
Garmatz	Macdonald	Reed
Gavin	Machrowicz	St. George
Harris	Merrow	Shelley
Hays, Ark.	Mollohan	Simpson, Pa.
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Tollefson
Hyde	Mumma	Van Zandt
James	Osmers	Vursell
Jenkins	Powell	Wharton
Kee	Priest	Williams, Miss.
Kilburn	Prouty	Young
King, Pa.	Rabaut	Zelenko
McCulloch	Rains	
McDowell	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to take a moment to thank the Members of the House who have by and large received my remarks with very great courtesy and attention. I know they realize it is an extremely difficult thing when every statement one has made upon a particular issue over the past several years has been challenged, how difficult it is to cover it as it should be covered; nevertheless, I much appreciate their courtesy in listening to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. 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. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, 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. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the pending bill and this project, I regret to find myself in disagreement with some of my friends from southern California. If I thought that this project would cost California one bucketful of water to which California is entitled from the Colorado River system, I would not be for this bill. Last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD to the extent of some 8,000 words my analysis of the legal situation with reference to the water rights of California on the Colorado, and because I regard that matter as a sectional matter and one which we Californians ought to settle among ourselves—but which unfortunately we have

not been able to settle among ourselves—I do not intend to take the time of the committee or of the House in dealing with that particular aspect of the case.

I may say before I start my discussion that we have tried to divide the time in this debate fairly. The gentleman from Nebraska, the ranking Republican member of our committee and former chairman of the committee, is supporting this bill, as is the gentleman from Colorado, who is handling the time on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Nebraska has, as I understand, agreed to yield approximately one-half of his time to those who want to speak in opposition and the gentleman from Colorado has taken the same position As a consequence, we are somewhat limited with reference to time because this is a long, difficult, and complicated matter.

I want to devote my time to giving to you the legislative history of this project, comment upon the economics of the project which have been challenged and make some reference to the relationship of this project to the farm surplus problem. If I can get over those 3 items briefly in the next 15 minutes and have some time left, I will be delighted to yield to Members on the floor. If not, perhaps at some later time if inquiry is made I will be glad to answer them.

I want to go into the legislative history to some extent because I know it is not possible for every Member of this House to be an expert on every piece of legislation that comes before it. You simply have not the time, any more than I do, to study the whole record on each bill. You have to take someone's judgment for what is right with reference to some of these bills. So it is important to me, I know, when I sit out here as a Member of the House and listen as a juror to those who are acting as advocates of particular legislation to be informed as to who has passed on the legislation and who have found it to be sound and who have found it to be unsound. Therefore, I want to run through this very briefly for the purpose of demonstrating to you that every executive agency that has examined this project has approved it and every time this project has appeared before a legislative body of this Congress it has passed.

A report on the Colorado River storage project was completed and the project was approved by the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation on December 15, 1950. That was during a Democratic administration. The project was approved by the former Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Michael W. Straus, on December 22, 1950, and by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951. That Secretary of the Interior was a Democratic Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar Chapman. It was approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Dexheimer, on November 13, 1953, in a Republican administration and by Secretary McKay on December 10, 1953. Therefore it is correct to say that this legislation has had the bipartisan approval of the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation under the command of the Democrats when they were in power, and since then under the command of the Republicans. This is not a Republican project in any sense of the word. This project was initiated back in 1936 under a study which continued until the first report was submitted in 1950.

Now, in response to an official request by the Secretary of the Interior for the views and recommendations of the States affected, Wyoming approved the project in March 1951 and again in December 1953. The reason each State approved it twice is because when the Democratic Secretary of the Interior got the report he sent it to all the States. When the Republican Secretary of the Interior got into office, he sent it to all the States. As a consequence Wyoming approved it twice. Utah approved it twice. New Mexico approved it twice. Arizona approved the project in June 1951 and again in January 1954, and Nevada approved the project in November 1951. The State of California approved the project on June 14, 1951, but on February 15, 1954, restricted its approval to the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir and the principal features of the project.

The Federal Power Commission approved the project on February 26, 1954. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the project on April 5, 1954. The Department of Agriculture approved the project on March 23, 1954. The Corps of Engineers approved the project on February 4, 1954. The Bureau of the Budget, which is supposed to be the sharpest outfit around here with a pencil, especially under a Republican administration, approved the project on March 18, 1954, and the President approved the project and issued a statement thereon on March 20, 1954.

Now, I emphasize these executive approvals because they indicate that probably as many as 1,000 top men who are experts in the water and power field have given examination to this project and not one single one of those agencies has ever disapproved it. If this project is as far out of line and as fantastic as some people would try to make you believe, then I say there are a lot of men in the executive branch of the Government, both in this administration and in the past, who ought to have their heads examined.

In addition to that, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably reported this bill by a vote in the last session of 11 to 1, and the Senate itself in April of 1955 passed the project 58 to 23. You have already heard that our committee approved this project by a vote of 20 to 6. In other words, this project has on three occasions gone before legislative bodies of this Congress, and in one instance carried by 11 to 1, in another instance carried by more than 2 to 1, and before our own committee carried by better than 3 to 1. So this project has been approved every time it has been put to the test. Now, I grant that it is not possible for all of you to make the careful analysis of this legislation that these people have in the executive branch of the Government and those who serve upon these committees, but I think I should say this, that whenever you get that kind of favorable reaction to legislation by those who have studied it, then you have a right to say that you can place some confidence in the correctness of that judgment. I know you are not going to dig through the deluge and the barrage of contradictory statements in regard to the facts with reference to this legislation, but here are the men, the agencies, and the legislative bodies that have approved what we are saying are the facts with reference to this legislation. The President of the United States, on so many occasions that I will not mention them all, has urged this legislation.

We have a little different bill before you than the one which was voted out by the Senate. The Senate bill was a great deal larger. Our House committee cut it in half for all practical purposes. Their bill was $1,658,000,000. As I said, it passed the Senate by a vote of better than 2 to 1 even in that shape. We cut it in half. We took out the controversial Echo Park feature and thereby secured the support of many of the conservation people throughout the country.

We have adopted some amendments since this bill was voted out of our committee in the last session and approved by the Committee on Rules for consideration on the floor. The amendments all fall within and are consistent with the repayment plan proposed in H. R. 3383 as initially reported.

Essentially, these amendments do two things. First, the amendments which have been added make the legislation acceptable, as I have said, to the conservation groups and as indicated in the supplemental report, all of those groups now favor the legislation. Secondly, the amendments carry out the unanimous agreement recently reached among the upper basin States relative to spelling out in greater detail the accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. That is a bookkeeping matter.

That is the bill that is before you at the present time. It is the bill initially voted out as amended and brought before you as set out in the supplemental report. So, when you want to see what the bill is, read the supplemental report which contains the bill as we voted it out with the amendments in italics. That covers the legislative history of this bill.

I have referred to the approvals which this legislation has had because I want to speak briefly of the economics of this project and its repayment. The fact is, as stated on page 12 of our committee report that in 50 years following the last power installation, the project revenues will amount to $1,075,000,000. This will be sufficient to repay (1) the power investment with interest, and (2) the required irrigation assistance of $246 million, and (3) leave a surplus at the end of that time of $86 million. That is the cash money that will be in the Treasury of the United States.

These two charts which I have here give a breakdown of the figures and give the allocations to each of the elements in the project and the total revenues that will be secured. These are the charts which have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation with the approval of the Department of the Interior. They have the approval of all of these executive

agencies to which I have referred, including the Bureau of the Budget.

We will see some other figures around here, but these are the figures that have come up from downtown, in two administrations. The chart which is shown in color is one which gives a quantitative display of the cost of the project and the repayment. You will see that the repayment quantitatively is just a little more than twice the total cash cost of the project.

There is one thing, I think, I should point out to you, because I should like to say that this project is every bit as good as the Central Valley project in California so far as repayment to the Federal Government is concerned—and the Central Valley project in California is the most famous irrigation and reclamation project in the world. This project pays out just as that project does—the Federal Government gets its money back. The difference is this, that the irrigators do not pay so much. You have heard of the high cost per acre. The people in the area are going to pay that. The irrigators do not pay very much. If you look at this small red slip, that represents about 15 percent of the total cost of the irrigation works. So the irrigators do not pay very much. They pay all that they can pay, but the power users step in and pick up the rest of it. All of the money comes out of those four great States, out of their consumers, out of their resources, and out of their people.

How does it make any difference to the Federal taxpayer whether a power consumer who turns on a light helps pay back this bill or an irrigator pays it back? Let us assume that the irrigators are going to pay half of it. Under reclamation law, all we do is reduce the power rate. The power rate in this instance to carry this load has to be 6 mills. The power rate in this Nation has never gone down in all history. It does not make any difference whether the power consumer pays it, living out on his ranch, running a pump and lighting his house, and the little communities that this project feeds and sustains, or the irrigator. In the Central Valley project the irrigators will pay back about 66 percent of the cost, and power one-third. The power rate in the Central Valley project of California is 4 mills. If these irrigators could pay more we would just reduce the power rate. In any case, the Federal Government gets its money back. It would get the money back on the power investment. It will be the investment in the power plus the interest, the investment in municipal water plus the interest, and the Federal Government will get the irrigation investment back without interest, which is traditional under 50 years of reclamation law.

I assert that this project is just as good on its economics as any of them. The people I have mentioned who have recommended this project will say to you that it is engineeringly sound, that it is economically justified, and that it is financially feasible.

In addition—and this should be pointed out—because a great deal has been said with respect to the allocation among the States, there is sufficient money now in the national reclamation fund to put up over half—55 percent— of the amount of money which will go into this project. As a matter of fact, the only money that will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury to finance this project will be less than $18 million a year.

I have seen the tax chart sent around purporting to show the amount to be paid by each State. I wrote Mr. Dexheimer, the Reclamation Commissioner, and I asked him about that. This is what he said. He said that recent articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press contain erroneous and misleading data on proposals for authorizing additional reclamation projects.

Allegations are made that the cost of these projects would be proportionately assessed against the States of the Union according to the States tax burden. For the upper Colorado project, for instance, it is mentioned at $4 billion.

He says these statements are not in accord with the facts. The facts are that the reclamation fund, which will be discussed later in some detail by my colleagues, is made up out of money that comes from reclamation projects, out of oil and gas lease revenues, and out of public land sales in the West, which will constitute over 55 percent of the money going into this project.

The actual assessment, Mr. Dexheimer states, against the average taxpayer throughout the United States will be less than $18 million a year throughout the period of the construction of this project. That is not equal to the amount of money that will go into the power-producing features of this project. The interest-free features which, as you will see here, cost some $287 million, will come out of the reclamation fund and will not come out of the general tax fund, will not cost the taxpayers of this Nation anything whatsoever out of the general tax revenue. On the other hand, the investment in the power features of this project will pay the Federal Government back all of the principal and the interest.

I want to say something with reference to the farm surpluses, because it is contended that there is a basic inconsistency between authorizing this project and on the other hand setting up a soil bank. I assert that delivering water to these lands will move in the direction away from those surpluses which have troubled our Treasury and our Nation. There are only two of them that will be raised of any consequence in this area. They are wheat and corn. Experience has shown that when dry land producing wheat is irrigated, the land for the most part is diverted to other crops.

Here is an example. On the Columbia basin project where 500,000 acres have been brought under irrigation to date the wheat acreage has been cut by 90 percent and the production of wheat cut by 2½ million bushels a year. As the tremendous growth in the Columbia basin increases, there will be a further reduction in the production of wheat and it is estimated that by the time the project is completed, there will be a reduction of 5 million bushels of wheat per year. In short, the irrigation of these areas leads precisely away and in the opposite direction from these supported crops, and as a consequence it is not an addition to the surpluses of this Nation. What we are creating here is a water bank and not a soil bank—a water bank for future progress, development and living in that great area.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that the legislative history of this bill shows it has been approved by every executive agency and by every legislative group which has given it a hearing up to this time. It will not add to the surpluses of this Nation. The figures show that this project is engineeringly sound, economically justified, and financially feasible. It has been approved by the finest engineers in both this administration and in the past administration. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill goes to a vote in the final test that it has here before this legislative body, the record will be made 100 percent in the approval of the upper Colorado River basin project by every executive agency and legislative body before which it has been put to a test.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has made a very fine statement of the economics of the project and its effect upon reclamation in the West and in the Nation generally. In the few minutes I have at my disposal, I wish to bring to you a picture of the physical area concerned and also a very short statement of the legislation itself. The area of the Colorado River reaches from the southern parts of Wyoming, the northern parts of Colorado and Utah to the Gulf of California. Because of differences had during the early part of this century over the use of the water and the possible future uses of the water, a compact was entered into by representatives of the seven States concerned. The compact provided that the water of the Colorado River or rather the use of the water of the Colorado River would be divided at Lee's Ferry as far as the quotas between the two areas were concerned. Lee's Ferry is just south of the boundary between Arizona and Utah. Too, the lower basin was guaranteed the first 7½ million acre-feet of water. The upper basin was guaranteed the second half—whatever that might be, and if the water was not there, the upper basin would be the one that would be short. Also, the lower basin was allotted an extra million acre-feet of water which either rises within the bed of the river itself or rises from tributaries below Lee's Ferry. That was the Colorado compact—solemnly entered into by the States and approved by the Congress of the United States in 1923.

I can advise my colleagues without any fear of contradiction that the legislation proposed in H. R. 3383 is in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the other compacts and agreements which go to make up the "law of the river."

Already since 1930 some $400 million of Federal moneys have been spent to develop the area south of Lee's Ferry, mostly in southern California or along the river itself. Since 1939 and 1940,

moneys have been given to the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure in the upper basin to investigate, and survey, and make reports on projects which would do for the upper basin what has been done for the lower basin.

The reason the work has not proceeded faster is because the contribution from the Boulder Canyon fund is only $500,000 a year, and the amount appropriated by Congress has not been sufficient to firm up a faster job. But as the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has said, in 1946 the Department of the Interior filed with the Congress its first report. It filed with the Congress its second report on the Colorado River in 1947, with the statement of the various States, all of them favorable. Since that time we have been busy trying to draft legislation to bring before the Congress to start the development of resources, mostly water resources, but other developments too that necessarily go along with it in the upper basin.

The bill now before this Committee provides for 4 major units, 3 of which are power producing units and 1 of which is regulatory in streamflow only. I will name them.

The Glen Canyon Dam with which I think you are familiar. I think you are also familiar with the Flaming Gorge Dam; and may I suggest that there are those of us who still think the Echo Park site was more to be desired than Flaming Gorge, but we have been defeated in our purpose and we are willing to abide by the decision of the Committee and have taken Flaming Gorge in the northern part of Utah in place of Echo Park. While doing this we have entered into an agreement with the conservationists to the effect that we would not trespass upon any national park or national monument area in the construction of projects authorized under the provisions of this bill. I mention this because of a colloquy had during the discussion had on the rule between the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and myself relative to the position of the Sierra Club. Since that time I have talked to Mr. Brower, the director of the club, and he has assured me within the last 20 minutes that their opposition is withdrawn provided we place and keep within this bill the provisions that we will not trespass upon the national park or national monument areas.

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

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Because some of the Members were not here at the time the colloquy took place, would the gentleman mind explaining what was represented by the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado made the statement that the Sierra Club had withdrawn its opposition, that they were now not opposing it as they had in the first place. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] took issue with me and stated that within the last few days he had conversed with Mr. Brower and that that was not their position. So I immediately went to Mr. Brower, who I knew was in the gallery, and asked him. He said that I might advise you that they have withdrawn their opposition to this legislation provided we have within the bill the provisions to which I have just referred.

In addition to the two authorizations just referred to there is a conditional authorization for Curecanti, if and when the Secretary has found it feasible.

Also, there is an authorization at this time for Navaho as a regulatory dam. In connection with the welfare of the Navaho Indians, there is no possible use by them of the water to which they are entitled under treaty rights unless we start with the construction of the Navaho Dam or a similar facility.

Then, in addition to these 4 major projects, there are 11 participating projects which are authorized by this legislation.

The participating projects, with the exception of the central Utah project, are small irrigation projects which are necessary to put the water to use in the upper basin primarily for agricultural purposes. The central Utah project is a large project, it produces power, and it also provides water for municipal use in the Utah area. As I say, it is a large one. The participating projects are the only way by which benefits can be secured to any part of the area as far as irrigation is concerned.

In addition to this authorization, the bill names some 24 projects of some nebulous value in the upper basin to be studied further by the Bureau of Reclamation to see whether or not they do present any economic value which can be given to the area and to the Nation in the future providing Congress is willing to authorize them. The reason for this, of course, is quite apparent to those of you who have studied the legislation. Under this bill, the State of Colorado, which furnishes 70-plus percent of the total flow of the river and is entitled to 51.75 percent of the upper-basin allocation, gets only 5 small projects, the costs of which are in approximately $22 million. These projects do not provide for the consumptive use by the State of Colorado of the water to which it is entitled under its allocation. Therefore, in order to firm up possible development in the upper basin, especially in Colorado, these projects are named for further study. If they are economically and physically feasible, why, of course, they will be brought to the attention of Congress for future action.

The authorization for this project is $760 million. The members of the House committee can advise you that they intend to stay as near that figure as they possibly can provided we go to conference. The value of Federal aid to the lower-basin contributions already made is considerably over $400 million. Of course, this bill has a statement of intent to the effect that this is not to be the final development in the upper basin.

In the West we have, as many of you know, different water law than the rest of the Nation. Simply stated, it holds that he who first puts water to a beneficial use acquires a perpetual right to that use, a right which no man and no legal entity can impair. So long as the volume of water available for irrigation, power, and domestic and industrial use exceeded the demand, there was no problem. Then with increasing settlement came increasing demand, and the waters of western streams for irrigation and other uses became very valuable and an item of controversy not only among individuals but more importantly among States. The question of control or ownership was uncertain. Some held that the State of origin had complete control even to the point of stopping the entire flow of the river at the State line. Others held that the Federal Government had control of rivers in interstate concourse. Out of this controversy between individuals, States, and the Federal Government there slowly evolved a body of legal opinion that seemed to confirm the supreme right of the first user irrespective of point of origin of the water, place of use, or State line.

This apparent legal determination brought to a head a growing controversy over the waters of the Colorado River. As you know, settlement in the Southwest, coming up from Mexico, preceded that in the Rocky Mountain West. Additionally, most of the land along the lower reaches of the Colorado was flat, had a long growing season, and easily developed for agricultural use. This tended to mean that unless some division was made of the Colorado, first use in the lower basin would forever preclude any development in the upstream States where over 90 percent of the water supply originated. The major drawback to development in the lower-basin area was the erratic flow of the turbulent river. In the spring it was a raging monster, yet by late summer a dangerously low trickle. So far as southern California was concerned, the ever-present problem was just this. The Imperial Valley where the water was used lies below sea level and below the bed of the Colorado. This created a great danger that the Colorado would turn to this great sink—and, indeed, it did in 1905—and ruin all that had been built. Fighting the annual flood battle was a costly and uncertain proposition. Then late in the summer the low trickle was inadequate for vital water needed in the late-growing season. Beyond this, the then supply canal lay in part in Mexico and this made upkeep and flood prevention more difficult. These circumstances led very early to a determination in this area that flood control was mandatory and so was an all-American canal for water delivery. Storage was also important. Just a little later, the metropolitan area foresaw an end to local or native supply of domestic water and their eyes turned to the far-away Colorado. Economics was the big stumbling block to the achievement of this complicated diversion since it required great pumping operations and cheap electric power to operate them. Out of this, in time, evolved a program which would achieve all these ends and other important projects in southern California. What was required was flood control, river regulation, an all-American canal, and storage and power on the river to make feasible this ambitious undertaking.

In early form, the flood control could have been most easily and cheaply taken

care of by a relatively small dam as far down the river as possible, but this would have done nothing for either power, adequate holdover storage, or water regulation or for municipal water. Storage in the early stages appeared most favorable in dams as far up the river as possible, but it was questionable whether this was legal for the dams of necessity would have been in another State. These upstream dams would have taken care of the Imperial Valley irrigation and perhaps the all-American canal, but again have left out municipal water for want of cheap and accessible power in adequate amounts.

Thus it was that the lower basin area sought a program to achieve all these ends in an economic form since none but flood control and some irrigation could stand alone. In time—and with progress in dam engineering—came the concept of a huge dam and reservoir at the point closest to the metropolitan area so that its power would be marketable in the demand area. In this plan all needs could be met—the huge dam would provide both flood control annually any cyclical water regulation and control for both irrigation and municipal use. The huge power output could be utilized to pay for the dam structure and power features, provide cheap pumping power for the municipal water canal and also control the lower river so that lower power dams and diversion points for the municipal and irrigation water would be practical.

Now you will note, and the record is clear, that each separate desire had initially a separate solution of which only flood control was certain both as to economics and legality. You will also note that the key to unlock this dilemma was power, power in such amounts, at such cost, and in such location, that it would be salable in the power-market area, would be close enough for the municipal pumping and still provide a means of repayment for the only feature not directly related to either reclamation, municipal water supply, or flood control which were the only sure legal methods then existing under law. I say to you then that Hoover Dam and its blessing-bestowing power plant was not an incidental part of the legal flood control, reclamation, or municipal water supply, but rather the only thing that made the whole program even remotely feasible. And now southern California has the gall to come in and complain about the "cash register" dams of the Colorado storage project, and they at least are charged in part to irrigation while not one cent of Hoover Dam was ever charged to irrigation, which it made possible; municipal water, which it made possible; and the flood-control allocation was a minor part of the whole program. I am not speaking idly when I say that my face would be crimson should I so switch my position in just one generation.

But on to the water-use problem. Unless and until the lower-basin area, especially southern California, could insure its complete right to a minimum of water, this ambitious project, even if broken down into parts, was impossible. Up until this time, that is 1920, no final legal determination had been made or was even sure of achievement. Water right depended upon use and here use was impossible without a sure right.

Do not let me seem to imply that the upper-basin area stood by idly through this period. I have pride rather in saying that forward-looking men there were men who were also trying to find means to develop their resources through water use. With the uncertain status of water right, they feared that the lower-basin program would estop upper-area development and they accordingly gave logical opposition to such program seeking instead a uniform development along the river.

Into this ever hotter issue stepped the calm figure of an eminent Colorado water specialist to suggest a division of the water of the Colorado by treaty or compact as between the States desiring its use. This man, Delph Carpenter, thus became virtually the father of a treaty division which was finally achieved in Santa Fe, N. Mex., late in 1922. The lower-basin area, including southern California, welcomed this proposition to establish sure rights so that their development and their construction could proceed. Out of earlier meetings among the States involved, thus came a Colorado River Commission with two members appointed in official action by the Governor of each State—Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. In that concurrence of the Congress and the Federal Government was necessary—and indeed required by the Constitution—for such multi-State agreement, a Federal representative was appointed, Herbert Hoover, then Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hoover, incidentally, was elected by the commissioners as chairman of the interstate group.

Many meetings were held as this group attempted to divide the Colorado River water so much to each of the seven States. It soon became obvious that this was impossible. But in that there was a natural division into an upper basin area and a lower basin area, it was determined to divide the use between the two natural basins. In addition, a decision was rendered by the Supreme Court that the first user of water had the superior right, irrespective of State line—Wyoming against Colorado—in the summer of 1922, and this provided the final push to find an agreement. When worked out, that unanimous agreement was to divide the water in perpetuity between the two natural areas, the upper basin, or highland area, from which the water came, and the lower, or sea-level area. The only reason that the wording did not read as a straight division was that Mr. Hoover, in proper support of the Federal interest, could not then accede to a final ownership or control of interstate water by the States. Nonetheless, the sole purpose of the commission and the compact it drafted was to divide the water and its attendant use.

[H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Report by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Representative of the United States (H. Doc. 605, 67th Cong., 4th sess.) p. A24]

Frequently in the past just such very serious conflicts have arisen on interstate streams resulting in prolonged and expensive litigation and causing long delays in development. This compact, when approved, will be a settlement of impending interstate controversies and an adjudication of rights to the use of the water in advance of construction, thus eliminating litigation and laying the groundwork for the orderly development of a vast area of desert land, estimated at some 4 million acres; the utilization of river flow now unused in the generation of hydroelectric energy, the possibilities of which are estimated at 6 million horsepower; the construction of dams for the control of floods which annually threaten communities in which over 75,000 American citizens now reside, with property worth more than $100 million; the establishment of new homes and new communities and the creation of a vast amount of new wealth.

The primary purpose of the compact is to make an equal division and apportionment of the waters of the river. For this purpose the river system is divided into an upper and lower basin.

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made. (Article 1 of the Colorado River compact negotiated and signed by the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Ratified by all States except Arizona, including a self limitation requirement for California, as a condition precedent to the Boulder Canyon project and proclaimed by President Hoover, June 25, 1929.)

This they achieved by "apportioning in perpetuity"—in article III (a)—"the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum" to each basin with each State to obtain its share—by later in basin agreement they thought—from its own basin. This apportionment was designed to and did exclude the doctrine of appropriation as to use between the two areas. Thus, the early right of the Imperial Valley attached only to lower basin water and not to any upper basin water up to its legal apportionment—section VIII, Colorado River compact.

Unfortunately, even after the adoption of the compact in 1922, controversy still continued. This was not, however, between the States of the upper basin and southern California. Rather, the upper basin States were happy to then add their weight to the passage of the act to build the Hoover Dam and its appurtenant structures and thereby set in motion the full development of southern California, for had they not just come to agreement that each area would have a firm and fixed share of water and firm and fixed right to its use? They also lent their support to other lower basin development under the same thinking. Arizona, the other major lower basin user, has been unable to achieve its hope of a major and long-planned development, but we have supported them. The opposition to

that project also centered in southern California.

However, over the next few years, it was with not only cooperation but active support from the upper basin area, that the nonreclamation area objection to the Hoover Dam program was finally overcome. May I say to you that the self-same arguments presently being used against the Colorado storage project were used against Hoover Dam and its related works—size, complexity, lack of power market for that cost of power, growing of already surplus crops, public-power opposition, cost, and just plain inertia. Each of these arguments has been doubly discounted by the passage of time and the success of these projects. The mighty Hoover Dam broke the back of the turbulent Colorado and made the lower basin flow useful and profitable. The cessation of the flood menace, the storage and the all-American canal fixed things up fine for the Imperial Valley. The river control made possible the installation of lower power dams and diversion points for other uses, including the metropolitan water diversion. The great storage made possible a firm and fixed supply of water for all periods of the growing season and municipal supply. Best of all, the cheap power made the metropolitan water pumping feasible and provided the cash register to repay, with interest, the cost of the dam and the generating works. By so paying for these, the other canals, diversions and uses could pay for their part of the overall facilities.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In other words, if power were not assuming a large proportion of the original cost of Boulder Dam, it would be quite difficult for flood control or reclamation and other uses, river regulation, to repay the Government for the original investment

Mr. SCATTERGOOD (chief electrical engineer and general manager of the Bureau of Power and Light of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles). It would be utterly impossible, because reclamation could not stand any such cost or even a reasonable share of that cost. (Hearings before Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 6629, 1939.)

As a matter of further fact, the Superior Court of California held that the Boulder Canyon project was not even an irrigation project and that requirements of section 4 of the Reclamation Act had no application—Evan T. Hewes, substituted for John L. DuBois, et al., against All Persons et al., see page 52, Federal Reclamation laws, annotated.

Further reference could be made to the committee hearings on H. R. 9093 in the 3d session of the 76th Congress, pages 118 through 123, or to pages 535, 536 of the first edition of the Hoover Dam documents by Wilbur and Ely, and it must be the first edition for this material does not appear in the later edition except as a reference to see appendix such and such in the first edition.

Here recorded is a letter from John B. Miller, then chairman of the board of Southern Edison Co., written to Secretary of Interior Wilbur which reads:

As has been repeatedly pointed out, the Boulder project is chiefly a water project and our interest in that project is simply securing for the community which we serve the assurance as to an additional supply of water which the community believes it will require.

So far as power is concerned, it is more costly under the contract price proposed than power which we are securing from the alternate source of steam plants.

Even though the Black Canyon site so appropriated—and I use the word "appropriated" since private groups had filed on the site before the whole canyon area was withdrawn by the Federal Government—was the best on the river and even though the lowlands are the best of the area for irrigation, the example of this huge program not only paying its way but creating vast new wealth, is ample demonstration that the Colorado storage project—to utilize water apportioned way back in 1922—will do the same in the upper basin area. As the lower basin development could follow only the achievement of agreement among the States as to water use and the cooperation of at least 6 States in passage of the legislation for construction, it follows that the same situation should obtain for the upper basin. As the Hoover Dam and related works was the program to allow the lower basin the use of its apportioned share of this vital water, so is the Colorado storage project the long delayed but long planned and expected program for use by the upper basin of its share of the water. We fail to understand why what was sauce for southern California is not now sauce for the upper basin. Yet, on the contrary, they are trying to cook our goose. We must have a program similar in magnitude and concept to this if we are to use our legal allotment of water, and the upper basin States got together not long ago and peacefully divided their upper basin area share. In the lower basin, California has Arizona in the courts and tried to drag us in. Just as the late flow was inadequate for safe use for irrigation in the Imperial Valley—before any metropolital diversion above it—before storage was provided, so is any safe use in the upper basin impossible in low-water years without compensatory storage in and for the upper basin. Such holdover storage will insure that the upper basin can use its legal share of the erratic flow and still deliver the apportioned sum to the lower basin and Mexico annually.

This need stems all the more forcefully from a dramatic decrease in the average flow of the Colorado. In 1922 when the compact was hammered out, the river was thought to flow in excess of 16 million acre-feet. The average now is down to about 12 million acre-feet, or less by far than the legal division of 7½ million acre-feet to each basin plus 1½ million acre-feet for Mexico. Divide it how you will, you cannot get 16½ million acre-feet from 14 million, especially when the bulk of the total flow runs down the river at flood crest when the snow melts in the spring. Holdover storage in the upper basin is required to regulate seasonal flow and also to save wet year water for dry year delivery downstream. Only a bit over half of our legal allotment can be used as a safe supply without such compensatory storage. Efforts to use more would have an adverse effect on all users all along the river in low flow years. At the time of the compact negotiations, Arizona wanted the upper basin to build storage reservoirs similar to those now proposed to insure firm downstream delivery. So far as I can ascertain, California had no such interest for she knew that storage in her own area was necessary for the projects she so much wanted. Now the wheel has turned. Arizona supports this storage, but California, in the form of southern California objection, seeks to prevent the construction of storage other than her own. I say again, she so well knows the value of the power that she wants no other to obtain it. As it now stands, as a matter of fact, she is able to utilize all of the unused flow of the Colorado when it does come by—and she can catch it in storage—and utilize it for the generation of dump power at Hoover Dam. Why, they say to themselves, should we lose this virtually firm but actually cheap dump power? The only reason is that the whole legal structure of power production at Hoover rests upon the firm supply of only the 7½ million acre-feet of lower basin flow rights—plus Mexico—and all contracts for power have always recognized this fact and the corollary that development contemplated and planned for in the upper basin would reduce the power head to this legally defined minimum flow. So much for that.

CALIFORNIA FIGHTS TO KEEP CHEAP POWER, HEARING REVEALS

(By George S. Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—"The cat is out of the bag." California's testimony before the Senate Interior subcommittee, opposing authorization of the Colorado River storage project, shows that what she fears most is loss of the cheap dump, or secondary electric power which the city of Los Angeles is now buying from Hoover Dam.

The hidden feline was let loose by Gilmore Tillman, assistant city attorney of Los Angeles and attorney for the department of water and power, who confined all his testimony to the effect Los Angeles believes the storage project will have upon its contracts for power from downstream projects.

His views were later corroborated by Northcutt Ely, special counsel for the Colorado River Board of California and an assistant to the attorney general in California, when he made his presentation before the committee.

Mr. Tillman's testimony disclosed that for years the city of Los Angeles has been reaping a bonanza in cheap electric secondary power from Hoover Dam, but now that the filling of the proposed new dams in the storage project might cut off this so-called dump power, it can no longer rely upon it for their customers and their rates would have to be increased.

This excess of dump power, was acquired by Los Angeles as a happy circumstance of the inability of the upper basin States to develop their share of the resources of the Colorado River.

Now that the latter have banded together to obtain storage dams and participating projects for their own advantage, using only their own legal share of the water, Los Angeles has become excited, as revealed by Mr. Tillman's arguments, over the loss of power on which they had no claim in the first place and on which they have no claim now.

It was just the good luck of Los Angeles that it could buy and use this excess power at bargain rates. Now, the big town comes out into the open at last and is fighting

against losing something that never actually belonged to her.

The latter point is admitted by Mr. Tillman in his brief, in which he said, in discussing the amounts of energy involved:

"I wish to emphasize that I do not contend or even suggest that any of these estimates or assumptions by the Government constitute guaranties. They are necessarily based on two factors which cannot be anticipated with certainty—the actual runoff of the Colorado River and the time of the development of upstream diversions authorized by the Colorado River compact.

"If, in experience, either of these two factors deviates from the original estimate or assumption, and this deviation results in a dimunition of secondary or even firm power, as estimated, we have no ground for complaint.

"On the other hand, it is equally clear that the United States has no right willfully and voluntarily to divert to some other purpose of its own, water which would otherwise be available for the generation of firm and secondary energy at Hoover Dam.

"Upon this ground, as a representative of a public agency threatened with serious injury, I object to the construction of the storage units proposed in the bill now pending before this committee (S. 500) and their operation in the manner contemplated by the Department of the Interior as evidenced by House Document 364 and by testimony introduced before this committee."

Thus, as this reporter views his testimony, Los Angeles is now making claim to something which the city's own attorney says it has no right to claim.

Dump-power has always been sold wherever available, at cheaper rates than firm power, because the supply is neither stable nor predictable.

It is purchased at a risk and therefore commands a cheaper price.

The only power guaranteed Los Angeles at Hoover Dam is the firm power acquired under the contract. All else is gravy. It is this gravy Los Angeles is now seeking to hang on to, even if meant that Colorado and the upper basin States could never develop their own resources, in accordance with the river compacts.

Depriving Los Angeles of this nonguaranteed and fluctuating excess electric power, because the upper basin States will have some life-saving, river-regulating reservoirs to fill, now becomes an invasion and violation of the rights of the city of Los Angeles, according to Mr. Tillman.

The Los Angeles legal representative cities the amount of money the city has expended in transmission lines from Hoover Dam and how much it is now going to cost the city to buy fuel oil in case it cannot enjoy the use of the dump power it has been getting all these years at a low rate.

"In an average year," complained Mr. Tillman to the committee, "the water thus diverted (for filling the proposed reservoirs) necessarily will be replaced by 760,000 barrels of fuel oil. At a price of $1.80 per barrel, the oil thus substituted for falling water would cost $1,365,000."

Discussing it in further detail, Tillman says the total extra net cost for replacement fuel for all secondary energy, would be approximately $2,152,000 in a normal year.

Thus Los Angeles is now promoting a vested interest in a benefit from the river to which she admits having no guaranty. In fact, Mr. Tillman spelled out the demands of Los Angeles as follows:

"In order to fulfill its obligations and maintain the integrity of its existing contracts, the United States must:

"1. Deliver at Hoover Dam, for the generation of firm and secondary energy, the full run of the river, less all upstream diversions for domestic or agricultural purposes; or

"2. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, deliver to the Hoover Dam power contractors, at the applicable contract firm or secondary rate, energy which in quantity and in time and place of delivery is equivalent to that which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this upstream storage; or

"3. During the filling period of the proposed storage units, make full financial reparation to the Hoover Dam power contractors for the costs to them (including capital costs, where appropriate) of the replacement of all "firm" or "secondary" energy which would have been generated at Hoover Dam had no water been diverted to this up-stream storage."

The legalities of the situation, it may be noted, revolve around the questions raised by Governor Johnson, as to whether or not waters impounded by the upper basin for power generation, in order to regulate the river and provide power revenues for building the participating units can be witheld for those purposes or must be interpreted as surplus waters which must be released to the lower basin for beneficial consumptive use.

Quoting Governor Johnson on this matter by calling it a very fair assumption, Northcutt Ely, of Ely and McCarty, legal representatives here of the Colorado River Board of California, supports the position of Mr. Tillman and told the committee that water appropriated in the lower basin, even though excess or surplus waters, may not be withheld from use, for the generation of power. Mr. Ely asserted that if the upper basin States could curtail water during the filling period, legally, they could also do it lawfully at any other time.

"Is it your contention," asked Elmer Bennett, congressional liaison representative of the Interior Department, at the Senate hearings, "that the generation of power in the lower basin has a priority or preference somehow, under the compact, over power generation in the upper basin, assuming the right to use were on a par otherwise?"

"We say," replied Ely, "That the rights established under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the power contracts made thereunder, cannot lawfully be interfered with by the withholding of water at Glen Canyon or other upstream dams solely for power generation."

Whatever the outcome of this legal problem, accentuated by Governor Johnson's testimony and statements, it demonstrates the dog-in-the-manger policy of California charged by members from the upper basin States and that its real fear is the loss of its cheap "dump power" from Hoover Dam.

Do not think either that the passage of the Hoover Dam legislation was the last example of upper basin support for lower basin development. After Hoover was built and in operation, it was found by southern California that the program they had calculated would not work as they had planned or as they had said it would when obtaining agreement for support from the other States. Accordingly, they wished to have the Boulder Canyon Project Act revised. This led to a series of events culminating in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. This too is a great story if time permitted its telling, but I shall have to cover it rapidly and insert material to cover the parts which might be useful for reference.

I mentioned before that the record shows that all hands were fully aware of the fact that power at Hoover Dam was not an incidental to the development but rather the very key. Of the $173 million cost of Hoover, 100 percent was to be recovered from power. It may be that the now deferered $25 million flood control allocation will not be repaid, but all repayment comes from power alone. It was also known by many that contracts to take Hoover power were signed even though the allottee knew that the hydropower cost was in excess of then existing alternate generating facilities. Southern California had assured all questioners that the power would be taken at its cost, and so demonstrated in a show of remarkable faith by signing such contracts. Then, by the time power came on the line in 1937, events external to the Colorado had also altered the situation. Interest was down from 4 to less than 3 percent. Steam or other generation had increased in efficiency and decreased in cost—also due to depression prices—and the Federal Government had built such power projects as TVA, Bonneville, and initiated such projects as Fort Peck on the Missouri, where power rates were not on a competitive basis as for Hoover but rather on an amortizing basis at less cost. Such concept was written into the reclamation law in 1939 and represented a material advancement in resource development.

Naturally power users on the Hoover line wanted an adjustment in charges more in conformity with life. Under the Boulder Canyon Act, such readjustments could have been made in 1945, but millions in extra cost would be charged prior to that time. The other Colorado River States interposed objection—not to the readjustment but to potential changes in the original act applicable to them. Arizona and Nevada had each been guaranteed a payment of 18¾ percent of surplus revenues beyond the amount needed for repayment—the balance, or 62½ percent, of surplus revenue being allocated to repayment of flood-control features. And I may interpose the thought that this charge for flood control should never have been necessary, but this extra burden was accepted in order to get water and meet ill-conceived opposition. If the proposed rate adjustment were to provide solely for an amortizing basis, then these in lieu of tax payments to Arizona and Nevada would have been abrogated, and, in addition, the proposal to defer repayment of the flood-control allocation until after the repayment of all other costs would have postponed almost indefinitely the agreed payment into a special fund to provide for further study and development along the Colorado. This fund was to survey development all along the river, but its greatest value would have been to the upper basin area.

So it was that the interested States again undertook to negotiate their desires into an agreement. Accordingly each of the Governors appointed 2 members to a committee which, when 2 power allottees were added, become known as the committee of 16. This committee, when agreement was unanimously achieved, appointed a committee of three to draft the actual adjustment bill and present it to the Congress with proper notation of the unanimous agreement. One of the committee of three, and the one who carried the ball in the Senate

hearings, was the late Judge Clifford Stone, of Colorado. His contribution all the way through this matter was of considerable and then appreciated value. The appreciation did not last very long, but Judge Stone did live long enough to see the program report for the development of the upper basin and of Colorado, which report he understood to be an integral part of the Boulder Adjustment Act.

The unanimous agreement reached by the 7 States and power allotees was briefly: That interest charges be reduced from 4 to 3 percent; that rates be established not on a competitive but on an amortizing basis; that to replace the 18¾ percent promise to each of Arizona and Nevada, an annual payment of $300,000 would be made; that the repayment of the flood control cost be postponed at least until all other features were repaid; and, finally, to insure the future development along the Colorado that $500,000 annually be paid into the Colorado River development fund for investigation and construction subject to appropriation by Congress. These concepts were adopted, with the unanimous support of the upper basin Representatives as the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act. Should it seem that much was given for little, let the record also show that competent estimates at that time were that these adjustments would save southern California some $100 million, while the other changes were merely to insure certain payment of amounts stated in the original act since these payments would have been wiped out by California's suggestions for adjustment.

This adjustment act was passed in the summer of 1940—not long ago. Up until that time, cooperation and mutual support was a great thing according to southern California. However, when the plan of development for the upper basin was worked out from the money provided, as I mentioned, in the adjustment act, and from earlier studies, southern California decided that cooperation had lost all its purpose—all this in just a few years between 1940 and 1950. What was useful in 1940 to obtain a desired end, suddenly died in 1950 when others came forward with long-awaited plans of development. Since 1950, expensive opposition from southern California has become increasingly frantic and the last 14 months have brought an ever-increasing flood on antiupper Colorado storage project propaganda pouring from this well-organized and well-financed group—and you have seen this in the RECORD and elsewhere.

The program spelled out in this proposal is the outgrowth of negotiations and conferences of water leaders in the West going all the way back to 1900—or over 50 years. After these long negotiations and conferences of the interested States and Federal agencies, it was Colorado's thought that the water had been divided and its full use in each basin spelled out and provided for and use by States in the upper basin. Accordingly, Colorado has given its full and often crucial support to the great programs and projects which allowed southern California to develop for use over three-fourths of the whole lower basin share of water. It was understood that such mutual cooperation and support would continue, even though all agreed that the lower basin projects were least expensive and easiest to build.

In hours of need, as in the necessary adjustment of the original Boulder Canyon Act, and indeed in its very passage, Colorado has been pleased to help her neighbor. She has also acquiesced to use by other States of great volumes of water from the Colorado even though she alone supplies three-fourths of its total flow.

Now the hour has finally come for the development of her share. The very success of development, primarily in southern California, on the lower Colorado proves that this program is valuable and economically worthwhile to the Nation. We cannot understand southern California's opposition in any terms other than that she, in view of such values, wishes to have them all for herself.

Acting in conformity with section 15 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, passed in 1928, and section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, passed in 1940, the Bureau of Reclamation carried on extensive studies and investigations on the Colorado River. These investigations and the formation of a report were intensified in the years 1940 to 1945 and the forepart of 1946. On June 7, 1946, a departmental report of the Department of the Interior was issued. This followed and was based upon a report and recommendations, dated March 22, 1946, by the directors of regions 3 and 4, Bureau of Reclamation. The 1946 report stated that there was not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full expansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects referred to in the report. The report stated further that there was a pressing need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents and recommended that the States determine their respective rights in such matter. The report was submitted, as required by law, to the affected States for their respective views. Colorado submitted its comments and criticisms, and concurred in the conclusion that there should be an apportionment of water among the States of the upper basin. In his report to Congress on July 24, 1947, the Secretary of Interior recommended among other things "that the States of the upper Colorado River Basin and States of the lower Colorado River Basin should be encouraged to proceed expeditiously to determine their respective rights to the waters of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact."

Acting in conformity with the suggestions contained in the 1947 report the upper basin States negotiated and signed the upper Colorado River Basin compact which compact was approved by Congress April 6, 1949. The upper Colorado River compact is subject to the provisions and limitations of the Colorado River compact of 1922. It apportions the consumptive use of upper basin waters to the upper basin States as follows:

Arizona, 50,000 acre-feet.
Colorado, 51.75 percent of balance.
New Mexico, 11.25 percent of balance.
Utah, 23 percent of balance.
Wyoming, 14 percent of balance.

It provides further for the creation of an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. Other important provisions are: First, that States of the upper basin must assume the responsibility for losses of water occurring as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed in the upper basin; and second, that consumptive uses of water by Indians shall be charged to the State in which the use is made.

These acts then are the law of the river:

(a) The Colorado River compact.
(b) The Boulder Canyon Project Act.
(c) The California Limitation Act.
(d) The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act.
(e) The Treaty with Mexico.
(f) The upper Colorado River Basin compact.

The legislation now before this committee provides that whatever authorization is approved by Congress in this respect, the administration of such must comply with the "law of the river."

With the signing and approval of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the States of the area were in position to request of the Department of the Interior that it file its final reports with Congress on those projects ready for consideration by Congress. The States of the upper basin then proceeded to draft the necessary legislation. The first bill to be presented to prospective sponsors was forwarded from the upper Colorado River Commission, with offices in Grand Junction, Colo., on October 10, 1951. The substitute bill now before the committee is a greatly modified and reduced bill from the one originally recommended by the commission. The bill presently before us is also greatly reduced from the proposal as originally suggested by the Department. It is, however, the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the legislation now recommended is sufficient in authority, and size for the purposes intended.

When the upper Colorado River development report was approved by formed Secretary of the Interior Chapman, he said:

> The comprehensive plan for the upper Colorado River Basin provides a blueprint for one of the few remaining great basin areas of the West which are not already well on the way to full use of their water resources. The 48.5 million acre-feet of storage space provided for in the plan compares with present available reservoir storage of less than 2 million acre-feet. The hydroelectric capacity of 1,622,000 kilowatts compares with less than 125,000 kilowatts of existing capacity in the upper basin, including internal combustion and steam plants as well as hydroelectric plants.
>
> Now that the upper basin compact, which apportions the available water among the States, is in force, urgently needed irrigation projects may be undertaken to turn dry land into productive farms and to supplement the meager water supply on several hundred

thousand acres of presently irrigated land. An urgent need also exists for the hydroelectric power made possible by the storage reservoirs to permit utilization of the upper basin's natural resources, including timber and vast deposits of coal, petroleum, oil shale, phosphate, and other minerals.

This statement was accompanied by one from the then Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, Goodrich Lineweaver, when he said:

The States of the upper basin can realize the use of their apportioned water only when extensive river regulation is provided to assist them in meeting the downstream delivery of 75 million acre-feet in a 10-year period as provided by the Colorado River Compact. This regulation can only be obtained by means of large reservoirs holding over great quantities of water from years of high runoff to years of low runoff. Judging from past records, these cycles might be as long as 20 to 25 years. Therefore these reservoirs must be ready to store water many years ahead of the actual time of need for irrigation purposes.

In view of the existing national emergency, consideration should also be given to the suitability of the power features of the storage project as they relate to the national defense.

Bills authorizing the upper Colorado River project have been thoroughly and minutely considered by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior of the House. Over 100 hours have been spent in taking testimony during the last two Congresses. Approximately 25 hours of marking up procedures have been spent in considering the legislation; 2,886 pages of testimony have been taken. In fact, the legislation has been most thoroughly considered. Although there is a minority report it is only fair to advise this committee that the legislation now recommended has been reported to the House by a vote of better than 3 to 1 in the Committee on Interior.

H. R. 3383, as amended by the substitute here recommended, provides for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal water, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Two kinds of project installations are provided: First, the first category known as project units consisting of four major dams; and second, the second category known as participating projects consisting of 11 auxiliary or subsidiary smaller projects made up of smaller dams, division works and canals and laterals. Three of the larger units and one of the participating projects have hydroelectric facilities included in their construction and operation.

The pertinent facts of the major units which are to be used for the regulation of the river, storage of water to guarantee mutually agreed upon deliveries to the lower basin, and the production of needed electric power are:

Glen Canyon Dam to be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 13 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, the dividing point between the upper and lower basins. The dam would be a concrete, curved, gravity-type structure rising 700 feet from bedrock. The reservoir, which would be the final regulating storage point for deliveries to fulfill lower basin commitments under the compact, would have capacity of 26 million acre-feet including 20 million acre-feet of active capacity. The reservoir, when filled, would have a maximum water surface of 153,000 acres and would extend about 186 river miles up the Colorado, nearly to the mouth of the Green River, and 71 river miles up the San Juan. The reservoir would be the principal sediment repository in the upper basin. In 200 years, at present rate of sediment flow in the river, silt deposits would fill all inactive storage space and reduce the active storage space by half. The power plant would be located near the toe of the dam and would consist of seven generating units with a total installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts. The plant would have a mean power head of 480 feet. Total cost is estimated at $379,143,000.

Flaming Gorge unit includes the Ashley Dam which would be located on the Green River 32 air miles north of Vernal, Utah, and the same distance downstream from the Utah-Wyoming border. Ashley Dam would be a concrete, gravity-type structure rising 491 feet from bedrock. Flaming Gorge Reservoir, created by the dam, would have total storage capacity of 3,940,000 acre-feet including active capacity of 2,950,000 acre-feet. When filled, the reservoir would have a water surface area of 40,800 acres and would extend 91 miles upstream, to within 3 or 4 miles of the town of Green River, Wyo. The powerplant would consist of 3 units with a total installed capacity of 72,000 kilowatts operating under a mean head of 395 feet. Estimated cost of construction is $74,648,000.

Navaho Dam site is on the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico, about 19.5 river miles upstream from Blanco and 34 miles east of Farmington, N. Mex. It is 3.5 miles downstream from the confluence of the Pine and San Juan Rivers. The dam would be an earth-fill structure 360 feet high and the reservoir would have a total capacity of 1,200,000 including an active capacity of 1,050,000 acre-feet. When filled to capacity, the reservoir would have a water surface of 10,800 acres and would extend 33 miles up the San Juan River to 3.5 miles beyond the town of Arboles, Colo. The powerplant would have 3 units with installed capacity of 30,000 kilowatts and operate under a mean head of 275 feet. Total cost is estimated at $32,933,000.

Curecanti unit includes a concrete, gravity structure rising 510 feet from bedrock and located a few miles downstream from Sapinero, Colo., on the Gunnison River. The capacity of the Curecanti Reservoir would be 940,000 acre-feet of water with as yet an undetermined amount of hydroelectric power. In addition to the major dam it is contemplated that there shall be three smaller power-producing dam installations a short distance down the river from the major dam itself.

The participating projects with pertinent facts for each one are:

Central Utah project, Utah: The comprehensive Central Utah project, a large multiple-purpose development, is of such magnitude that it has been planned in two parts—the initial phase, a unified portion that could operate independently, and the ultimate phase. Only the initial phase is included in the group recommended for initial participation in the upper Colorado River account.

The initial phase would intercept the flow of streams on the south slope of the Uinta Mountains as far east as Rock Creek and would convey the water westward by gravity flow for use in the Bonneville Basin. Water for replacement and expanded irrigation in the Uinta Basin would be provided by storage on local streams. Several regulatory reservoirs would be required in both the Bonneville and Uinta Basins, the principal one being the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir on the Strawberry River. By construction of Soldier Creek Dam the capacity of the reservoir would be increased from 283,000 acre-feet to 1,370,000 acre-feet. The initial phase would provide for the irrigation of 29,600 acres of new land and 165,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water or improved water regulation. It would also provide 48,800 acre-feet of water annually for municipal, industrial and related uses. It would generate each year approximately 359,100,000 kilowatt-hours of firm energy and 3,400,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy.

Emery County project, Utah: Irrigation water would be furnished 24,080 acres of land under existing canals diverting water from Cottonwood Creek to Huntington Creek in east-central Utah near Castle Dale. Supplemental water would be provided for 20,450 acres of the land and a full new supply would be provided for 3,630 acres. The irrigation water would be made available through storage of surplus spring runoff at a 57,000 acre-foot reservoir at the Joes Valley site on Cottonwood Creek. Water for lands in the Huntington Creek area would be conveyed by canal from Cottonwood Creek.

Florida project, Colorado: Lemon Reservoir, with a capacity of 23,300 acre-feet, would be formed by the Lemon Dam on the Florida River in southwestern Colorado, southeast of Durango. This reservoir would regulate the Florida River runoff to provide an irrigation water supply for 18,950 acres, including 12,650 acres now irrigated with only a partial supply and 6,300 acres not now irrigated. Approximately 1,000 acres of the land in the project area are Indian owned. The regulatory storage provided for irrigation would reduce floods which nearly every year cause extensive damage along the river course.

Hammond project, New Mexico: The Hammond project would divert natural flow of the San Juan River to provide an irrigation supply for 3,670 acres of presently unirrigated land along the south side of the river near Bloomfield, N. Mex. The water would be diverted from the river by a low diversion dam and conveyed to the project land by a gravity canal. A pumping unit would be installed to lift water 49 feet from the gravity canal to two highline laterals that would serve about 1,100 acres of the project land.

La Barge project, Wyoming: Unregulated natural flow of the Green River would be diverted for the irrigation of

7,970 acres of land located west of the river between Big Piney and La Barge in southwestern Wyoming. Only 300 acres of the land are cultivated and partially irrigated at present. The principal construction feature would be a canal 38 miles long, mostly of earth section.

Lyman project, Wyoming: Water would be stored in an offstream reservoir of 43,000 acre-foot capacity at the Bridger site on Willow Creek to furnish supplemental irrigation water for 40,600 acres of land along Black Fork near the town of Lyman in southwestern Wyoming. The reservoir would be fed by canals from Black Fork and West Fork of Smiths Fork.

Pine River project extension, Colorado and New Mexico: The extension is planned to enlarge and lengthen distribution works in order that storage water already available in Vallecito Reservoir of the Pine River project might be furnished to some of the arable project land still unirrigated in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico. The extension would serve 15,150 acres of land, including 1,940 acres administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Seedskadee project, Wyoming: This project would irrigate 60,720 acres of presently unsettled land located along both sides of the Green River in southwestern Wyoming, about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. The land would be irrigated by gravity diversions from the Green River. Two drops in distribution canals would drive turbines to lift water to higher land. No reservoir storage would be required.

Silt project, Colorado: A reservoir of 10,000 acre-feet capacity would be constructed on Rifle Creek in west-central Colorado near Rifle. Most of the reservoir water would be released to water users downstream, replacing part of the natural flow heretofore used. In exchange for the storage water an equivalent amount of natural-flow water would be diverted from East Rifle Creek above the reservoir and conveyed to project land in Dry Elk Valley and on Harvey Mesa. Water would also be conveyed from the reservoir to land under the Davie ditch in Rifle Creek Valley. During the low stages of the reservoir pumping would be required. In all, 5,000 acres of land would be provided a supplemental water supply and 1,790 acres would be provided a full new supply.

Smith Fork project, Colorado: Surplus runoff of Smith Fork and Iron Creek would be regulated in a reservoir of 14,000 acre-foot capacity at the Crawford site on Iron Creek in west-central Colorado near Crawford. Water from Smith Fork would be diverted to the reservoir by feeder canal. The stored water would be conveyed by canal to land on Grand View Mesa and land adjacent to Cottonwood Creek. Part of the released storage water would replace natural flow on this land, permitting additional diversions of natural flow to land above the reservoir in the upper Smith Fork Basin. A total of 9,800 acres would be benefited, including 7,670 acres now inadequately irrigated and 2,130 acres of dry land.

Paonia project, Colorado: The Paonia project provides for construction of a dam at Spring Creek "B" site on Muddy Creek, a tributary of the north fork of the Gunnison River. The dam will form a reservoir of 18,000 acre-foot capacity in the west-central Colorado near Paonia. The reservoir will provide supplemental water for 14,830 acres now irrigated with only a partial water supply and a full supply for 2,210 acres not heretofore irrigated. Work is nearing completion on the enlargement and extension of the Fire Mountain Canal which will distribute project water. Land served from the extension will include land now irrigated from Minnesota Creek and land on Rogers Mesa now irrigated from Leroux Creek. Leroux Creek water will then be diverted higher upstream and used for irrigation on Redlands Mesa.

Some 24 probable participating projects are listed in section 2 of the legislation for further study and determination by the Bureau of Reclamation. There is no attempt at authorization of these projects in this bill—only a direction for their further survey. Each one if found to have merit and feasibility must be brought back to Congress for study and final legislation.

The legislation now before this committee does not contain the controversial Echo Park unit. The substitute legislation proposed by the committee goes much further in that it provides "that as part of the Glen Canyon unit, the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument"; and, further, "it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument." And may I here and now advise this committee that the sponsors of the legislation promise and agree with the Members of the House that they shall keep their agreement with the conservationists of the Nation in this particular.

The bill as now recommended to the House complies with all important and pertinent provisions of the national reclamation law of 1902 and acts amendatory thereto. The repayment features, although somewhat technical, are in virtual conformity with all reclamation-law requirements. In some particulars there is a closer conformity to such requirements than in like-size projects heretofore authorized, many of which are already constructed, and others now in the process of construction. The recommended legislation provides for the construction and Federal control of necessary transmission lines and the sale of electric power to preferential customers as provided in general reclamation law.

The 160-acreage limitation provision of reclamation law is applicable. The small amount of facilities required for public recreation and propagation of fish and wildlife values must be constructed and operated in accordance with reclamation law.

By the expressed terms of the bill any and all construction is entirely dependent upon budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the Nation—Congress and its pertinent committees having absolute control in this respect.

Planning for development shall have regard for the achievement in each State of the fullest consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the law of the river in the storage and release of waters impounded by the facilities to be constructed under the provisions of this legislation. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to comply any State of the Colorado River basin is authorized to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce compliance.

The amount of the authorization is $760 million and the committee is of the opinion that the cost of the work authorized by the bill can be kept well within this figure. This total amount is indeed a large sum. However, it is to be expended over a period of approximately—if times continue to be fairly good—25 years. The amount of moneys needed in any 1 year will never amount to more than $40 million. This means that in no year during its entire construction will the general treasury of the United States be asked for more than $18 million. In fact, at the end of the construction period the drain on the general treasury will be far less—this because of the fact that the reclamation fund itself will be able to furnish 75 percent of all moneys needed. The amount of the total authorization compares favorably with Central Valley of California up to now; far less than the authorization for the Missouri River Basin, which is proving so beneficial to the basin specifically and to the Nation generally; and about one-half of the total amount needed for the financing of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, in which project our country has agreed to furnish a rather major part.

The need is immediate for getting started on the actual construction of this project. We have reached the point in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming where we cannot consider any substantial further development of the waters of the Colorado River until we have achieved a measure of regulation of the erratic flow of the river. By regulations, of course, I mean that approach to equalization of flow of the river system, which can be achieved only by storage. This storage must be of such capacity that flows in wet years can be caught and held for release in dry years to meet our commitment to the lower basin. Without such equalizing storage any full development in the upper basin would have disastrous effects on both basins in low water years. Without the benefits of cyclical storage we can only sit and watch the waters run downhill.

Immediately following the decision of the sponsors of H. R. 3383 to not bring it up for House consideration during the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, a further study of some of the provisions of the bill was made by various representatives of the upper basin States. After many conferences it was decided that the legislation would be more equitable to all of the States directly concerned in the upper basin if further provisions were incorporated in the bill to guarantee to each of the upper basin States possible water resource development so each of said States would be able to put to consumptive use the

waters allocated to it by the upper Colorado River basin compact. Accordingly, there have been incorporated in section 5 of the bill, that section having to do with the establishment of the basin fund and the bookkeeping procedures relative thereto, provisions which after certain general repayment obligations would divide the excess net revenues accruing from the storage facility projects equitably among the States.

Before final recommendation to the House of these new suggestions, the Office of the Department of Interior was requested to review the repayment analysis of various projects of the bill, especially the central Utah project, to ascertain whether or not the Department of the Interior could comply with the new suggestions and successfully administer the legislation.

Their reply was forwarded to the committee under date of February 6, this year, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: During an informal conference in your office on February 1, 1956, representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation were asked to review the repayment analysis of the central Utah project (initial-phase development) in view of certain amendments now under consideration concerning procedures set out in H. R. 3383, a bill for authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

We are pleased to comply with your request and submit the results of our review based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period.

These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage-project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of—

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs;

(b) Interest on power investments;

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation;

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Under the terms of the proposed amendments of H. R. 3383 a basin fund could be established providing the Utah projects the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent. In doing so, total credits in the basin fund would be governed by the requirements of Utah's participating projects because of their magnitude. Credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383. In fact only one-third of these credits will be required to complete the repayment of all the projects proposed in H. R. 3383, namely, central Utah and Emery County projects in Utah; Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, and Florida projects in Colorado; the Pine River extension project in Colorado and New Mexico, the Hammond project in New Mexico, the Seedskadee, La Barge, and Lyman projects in Wyoming, and the presently authorized Eden project in Wyoming.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

Immediately thereafter a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation delivered to me a statement of the Bureau's repayment summary, together with a statement of its analysis. I include both at this time for the consideration of this committee. It is my understanding that the Bureau's letter, summary, and analysis amount in fact to a statement by them that they are able and willing to conform in this respect to the wishes as expressed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT SUMMARY—COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH H. R. 3383 DATED FEBRUARY 8, 1956

This repayment summary of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects has been prepared to demonstrate how repayment of the project could be accomplished as required by H. R. 3383 dated February 8, 1956.

Storage units consisting of Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho Dam and Reservoir and participating projects consisting of La Barge, Seedskadee, Lyman, Eden, Silt, Smith Fork, Paonia, Florida, Pine River extension, Emery County, central Utah (initial phase) and Hammond have been included in this analysis with construction costs limited to approximately $760 million as prescribed by H. R. 3383.

This analysis has been accomplished based on the following assumed general criteria:

1. Each participating project must repay its own annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs.

2. Net revenues (revenues in excess of operation, maintenance, and replacement costs) from each participating project are to be used in repaying its remaining reimbursable costs as follows:

(a) Total power costs are to be repaid within a period of 100 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(b) Total municipal water costs are to be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years with interest (2½ percent per annum) being a first charge.

(c) Irrigation costs are to be repaid up to the ability of the irrigator to repay over a contract period not to exceed 50 years exclusive of a development period except for Paonia and Eden projects whose contract periods are fixed by law.

3. Net power revenues from the Colorado River storage project are to be used to repay irrigation costs of each participating project or separable features thereof in excess of the ability of the irrigator to repay during his contract period. These power revenues, when augmented by the irrigator's payments, are to retire the irrigation cost of each participating project in equal annual installments during the irrigator's contract period.

4. The storage project revenues are to assist the participating projects through establishment of credits in a basin fund. Credits are to be allotted 46 percent to Colorado, 21.5 percent to Utah, 15.5 percent to Wyoming, and 17 percent to New Mexico.

5. Credits are to be established in the basin fund from revenues from units of the storage project remaining after payment of:

(a) Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

(b) Interest on power investments.

(c) Equal payments (50 in total number) toward the storage project cost allocated to irrigation.

(d) Amounts sufficient to retire the power investment in a period not to exceed 100 years.

Net revenues from the units of the storage project and from the participating projects approximating $1,800 million would be adequate to repay all the costs of the project under the terms or conditions established in H. R. 3383 and in addition would provide a surplus in the basin fund of some $480 million even with power costs being repaid with interest in 82 years following installation of the last power unit, a considerably shorter time than permitted by H. R. 3383.

A brief tabular summary and a detailed payout schedule are attached. Under H. R. 3383 some flexibility is inherent in the repayment of the project power costs. Should the Curecanti unit be included in the immediate future there would be a somewhat greater surplus in the basin fund. Also, the basin fund could be increased somewhat by extending the construction schedule of major participating projects.

Repayment summary

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	Construction cost	Interest during construction	Reimbursable cost
Estimated project cost	758,813		
Allocation of costs:			
Irrigation	[1] 282,784		[2] 292,106
Power	422,744	31,231	453,974
Municipal and industrial water	40,950	1,446	42,396
Subtotal reimbursable	746,478		788,476
Ultimate phase features central Utah	4,950		
Nonreimbursable costs	7,385		
Repayment of reimbursable costs:			
Irrigation [2]			292,106
From water users			36,546
From power revenues			255,560
Power [3]			453,974
Municipal and industrial water [3]			42,396
Subtotal			788,476
Interest paid on project investment:			
Power [4]			492,768
Municipal and industrial water [4]			32,332
Subtotal			525,100
Surplus revenues			481,631
Total net revenue			1,795,207

[1] Excludes $9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.
[2] Includes $9,322,000 expended on Eden and Paonia projects under previous authorization.
[3] Includes interest during construction.
[4] Excludes interest during construction.

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956

[Units $1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
			Application of net revenues [1]									Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment			
		Total	Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment	By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Annually	Accumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
	1957													3,643	3,643				
	1958													3,158	6,801				
	1959													3,644	10,445				
	1960														10,445				
	1961													4,460	14,905				
	1962						13	13				275,976	275,976	87,785	102,677				
1	1963	7,659	6,899	−702	1,462	1,462	30	1,492				27,330	304,008	2,072	103,257	1,353	1,353		
		10,475	7,600	1,413	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	34	14	27,330	329,925	43,415	145,180		1,339		
	1965	13,297	8,248	3,587	1,462	1,462	30	1,492	48	33	15	27,330	353,668	20,945	164,633		1,324		
		16,065	8,842	5,035	2,017	2,017	96	2,113	48	33	15	27,330	375,963		162,520		1,309	171	171
5		18,797	9,399	7,210	1,783	1,783	109	1,892	48	33	15	28,237	396,990	46,800	207,428		1,294	405	576
		21,502	9,924	9,270	1,849	1,849	137	1,986	48	32	16	22,711	410,431	19,800	225,242		1,278	459	1,035
		22,380	10,261	9,811	1,875	1,875	154	2,029	48	32	16	17,730	418,350		223,213	41,043	42,305	433	1,468
	1970	22,933	10,459	9,203	2,082	2,082	285	2,367	1,495	1,058	437		409,147		220,846		41,868	1,189	2,657
		22,831	10,229	8,433	2,275	2,275	377	2,652	1,495	1,047	448		400,714		218,194		41,420	1,894	4,551
10		22,723	10,018	8,536	2,296	2,296	387	2,683	1,495	1,036	459		392,178	12,600	228,111		40,961	1,873	6,424
		22,621	9,804	8,649	2,295	2,295	387	2,682	1,495	1,024	471		383,529		225,429		40,490	1,873	8,297
		22,510	9,588	8,354	2,416	2,416	419	2,835	1,495	1,012	483		375,175	12,019	234,613		40,007	2,152	10,449
	1975	22,405	9,379	9,046	3,134	3,134	573	3,707	1,495	1,000	495		366,129		230,906		39,512	846	11,295
		22,297	9,153	9,164	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	988	507		356,965		226,781		39,005	524	11,819
15		22,195	8,924	9,291	3,456	3,456	669	4,125	1,495	975	520		347,674		222,656		38,485	524	12,343
		22,087	8,692	6,982	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	962	533		340,692		217,995		37,952	2,434	14,777
		21,985	8,517	7,055	3,979	3,979	682	4,661	1,495	949	546		333,637		213,334		37,406	2,434	17,211
	1980	21,877	8,341	6,488	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	935	560		327,149	31,765	239,803		36,846	2,434	19,645
		21,775	8,178	6,549	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	921	574		320,600		234,507		36,272	2,434	22,079
20		21,667	8,015	6,604	4,614	4,614	682	5,296	1,495	907	588		313,996		229,211		35,684	2,434	24,513
		21,481	7,850	5,481	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	892	603		308,515		223,669		35,081	3,299	27,812
		21,295	7,713	5,432	4,851	4,851	691	5,542	1,495	877	618		303,083		218,127		34,463	3,299	31,111
	1985	21,115	7,577	4,374	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	862	633		298,709		212,345		33,830	4,095	35,206
		20,929	7,467	4,298	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	846	649		294,411		206,563		33,181	4,095	39,301
25		20,743	7,360	4,219	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	830	665		290,192		200,781		32,516	4,095	43,396
		20,563	7,255	4,144	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	813	682		286,048		194,999		31,834	4,095	47,491
		20,377	7,151	4,062	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	796	699		281,986		189,217		31,135	4,095	51,586
	1990	20,191	7,049	3,978	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	778	717		278,008		183,435		30,418	4,095	55,681
30		20,011	6,950	3,897	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	760	735		274,111		177,653		29,683	4,095	59,776
		19,825	6,853	3,808	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	742	753		270,303		171,871		28,930	4,095	63,871
		19,639	6,757	3,718	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	725	772		266,585		166,089		28,158	4,095	67,966
	1995	19,459	6,664	3,631	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	704	791		262,954		160,307		27,367	4,095	72,061
		19,273	6,574	3,535	5,069	5,069	713	5,782	1,495	684	811		259,419		154,525		26,556	4,095	76,156
35		19,087	6,485	3,438	5,070	5,070	713	5,783	1,495	664	831		255,981		148,742		25,725	4,094	80,250
		18,907	6,399	3,343	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	643	852		252,638		142,958		24,873	4,094	84,344
		18,721	6,316	3,240	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	622	873		249,398		137,174		24,000	4,094	88,438
		18,535	6,235	3,135	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	600	895		246,263		131,390		23,105	4,094	92,532
	2000	18,355	6,156	3,034	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	578	917		243,229		125,606		22,188	4,094	96,626
		18,169	6,080	2,924	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	555	940		240,305		119,822		21,248	4,094	100,720
40		17,983	6,007	2,811	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	531	964		237,494		114,038		20,284	4,094	104,814
		17,803	5,937	2,701	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	507	988		234,793		108,254		19,296	4,094	108,908
		17,617	5,870	2,582	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	482	1,013		232,211		102,470		18,283	4,094	113,002
	2005	17,431	5,805	2,461	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	457	1,038		229,750		96,686		17,245	4,094	117,096
		17,251	5,744	2,342	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	431	1,064		227,408		90,902		16,181	4,094	121,190
45		17,065	5,685	2,215	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	405	1,090		225,193		85,118		15,091	4,094	125,284
		16,879	5,630	2,084	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	377	1,118		223,109		79,334		13,973	4,094	129,378
		16,699	5,577	1,957	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	349	1,146		221,152		73,550		12,827	4,094	133,472
	2010	16,513	5,529	1,819	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	321	1,174		219,333		67,766		11,653	4,094	137,566
		16,327	5,483	1,679	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	291	1,204		217,654		61,982		10,449	4,094	141,660
50		16,141	5,441	1,535	5,071	5,071	713	5,784	1,495	261	1,234		216,119		56,198		9,215	4,094	145,754
		16,045	5,403	2,939	3,609	3,609	713	4,322	1,495	230	1,265		213,180		51,876		7,950	4,094	149,848
		15,955	5,329	2,923	3,609	3,609	713	4,322	1,447	199	1,248		210,251		47,554		6,702	4,094	153,942
	2015	15,865	5,256	2,905	3,610	3,610	713	4,323	1,447	168	1,279		207,352		43,231		5,423	4,094	158,036
55		15,769	5,184	973	3,413	3,413	648	4,061	1,447	136	1,311		206,379		39,170		4,112	6,199	164,235
		15,679	5,159	908	3,413	3,413	648	4,061	1,447	103	1,344		205,471		35,109		2,768	6,199	170,434
		15,589	5,137	979	3,345	3,345	619	3,964	1,447	69	1,378		204,492		31,145		1,390	6,128	176,562
		15,493	5,113	907	3,345	3,345	619	3,964	1,425	35	1,390		203,585		27,181		0	6,128	182,690
	2020	15,403	5,090	1,789	3,141	3,141	489	3,630					201,796		23,551			5,383	188,073
60		15,313	5,045	2,604	2,956	2,956	397	3,353					199,192		20,198			4,708	192,781
		15,217	4,980	2,573	2,895	2,895	374	3,269					196,619		16,929			4,769	197,550
		15,127	4,916	2,547	2,895	2,895	374	3,269					194,072		13,660			4,769	202,319
		15,031	4,852	2,948	2,767	2,767	342	3,109					191,124		10,551			4,464	206,783
	2025	14,941	4,778	4,992	2,045	2,045	188	2,233					186,132		8,318			3,126	209,909
		14,851	4,654	5,026	1,721	1,721	93	1,814					181,106		6,504			3,450	213,359
65		14,755	4,527	5,057	1,668	1,668	80	1,748					176,049		4,756			3,503	216,862
		14,665	4,402	7,506	1,149	1,149	67	1,216					168,543		3,540			1,608	218,470
		14,575	4,213	7,605	1,149	1,149	67	1,216					160,938		2,324			1,608	220,078
	2030	14,479	4,023	8,335	513	513	67	580					152,603		1,744			1,608	221,686
		14,389	3,815	8,453	487	487	49	536					144,150		1,208			1,634	223,320
70		14,299	3,606	8,572	487	487	49	536					135,578		672			1,634	224,954
		14,203	3,390	9,808	278	278	40	318					125,770		354			727	225,681
		14,113	3,144	9,964	278	278	40	318					115,806		36			727	226,408
	2035	14,023	2,895	11,128			18	18					104,678		18			0	226,408
		13,927	2,617	11,310			18	18					93,368		0			0	226,408
75		13,837	2,334	11,503									81,865					0	226,408
		13,837	2,047	11,790									70,075					0	226,408
		13,837	1,752	12,085									57,990					0	226,408
	2040	13,837	1,450	12,387									45,603					0	226,408
		13,837	1,140	12,697									32,906					0	226,408

[1] Generation based on full use of upper basin water apportionment by year 75.

1 (f) Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Financial repayment schedule in accordance with repayment conditions, storage units, participating projects, costs and allocations as recommended by House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in H. R. 3383, Feb. 8, 1956—Continued

[Units $1,000]

Year of power operation	Fiscal year	Net revenues from sale of power at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and initial phase of the central Utah project at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour				Repayment of irrigation costs			Net revenue from sale of municipal and industrial water	Application of net municipal and industrial revenues		Project investment						Excess power revenues	
			Application of net revenues [1]									Power investment		Irrigation investment		Municipal and industrial water investment			
		Total	Interest	Power investment	Irrigation investment	By power users	By irrigation	Total		Interest	Municipal and industrial investment	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Investment	Unpaid balance	Annually	Accumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
80		13,837	823	13,014									19,892					0	226,408
		13,837	497	8,928									10,964					4,412	230,820
		13,837	274	1,445									9,519					12,118	242,938
	2045	13,837	238	1,481									8,038					12,118	255,056
		13,837	201	1,518									6,520					12,118	267,174
85		13,837	163	1,556									4,964					12,118	279,292
		13,837	124	1,595									3,369					12,118	291,410
		13,837	84	1,635									1,734					12,118	303,528
	2050	13,837	43	1,676									58					12,118	315,646
		13,837	1	58									0					[2] 13,778	329,424
90		13,837																13,837	343,261
		13,837																13,837	357,098
		13,837																13,837	370,935
	2055	13,837																13,837	384,772
		13,837																13,837	398,609
95		13,837																13,837	412,446
		13,837																13,837	426,283
		13,837																13,837	440,120
	2060	13,837																13,837	453,957
		13,837																13,837	467,794
100	2062	13,837																13,837	481,631
Total		1,683,933	492,768	453,974	255,560	255,560	36,546	292,106	74,728	32,332	42,396	453,974	0	292,106	0	42,396	0	481,631	481,631

[2] Includes $1,660,000 in year 89 and $1,719,000 each year thereafter of excess power revenue from central Utah project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his fine speech, and for the outstanding job he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation. I do not believe I have ever witnessed a finer demonstration of patience, fairness, and legislative generalship, than has been displayed by Colorado's distinguished representative, WAYNE ASPINALL, during the long and tiring course of committee hearings and consideration of this bill. It has been a pleasure to serve on a subcommittee with such a chairman, and the House may rest assured that the legislation before it today has received committee consideration in the highest and most careful sense of the term.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

I have no personal ax to grind on this bill. No water or power would come into Nebraska; however, benefits would extend to the entire Nation—all 48 States would be more prosperous because new wealth is created—new industries spring up. New wealth will need many things from the industrial East. It will mean new markets, new jobs, a stronger national economy. I believe in this project as an investment in America. A growing, dynamic America needs to move ahead and prepare for the future.

I cannot, in my 13 years in Congress, recall a campaign more vigorous or more vocal than the one that has been waged by the Members of Congress, the associations, and the "lobbies," if you please, who have seen fit, in their wisdom, to express the fears that the upper Colorado project was a "give away," a water steal, that it would bankrupt citizens of every State in the Union, that the dams would not hold water, that the reservoirs would soon fill with silt, and that the crops grown under these project lands would add to the agricultural crops now in surplus and that the project is not feasible and would cost other States untold millions of dollars. These statements are false, and they will be exposed.

Most of this misinformation comes from the Colorado River Association and you ask, "Who is this association?" The description of this organization as written in the quarterly Lobbying Report to Congress is as follows:

Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Citizens' organization for presenting information concerning Colorado River water matters. Opposes any legislation jeopardizing California water rights on the Colorado River.

This organization has had unlimited funds for propaganda purposes.

I include at this point the lobbying report of the Colorado River Association:

TOTAL ANNUAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES REPORTED UNDER THE FEDERAL LOBBYING ACT BY NORTHCUTT ELY (OR ELY, MCCARTY & DUNCAN), THE COLORADO RIVER ASSOCIATION, AND THE SIX AGENCY COMMITTEE, 1951–55

Northcutt Ely (including law offices of Northcutt Ely and—during the two reported periods for 1955—Ely, McCarty & Duncan). (Totals listed cover only the following organizations as employers: Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Imperial Irrigation District, Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, Water Project Authority of the State of California, and the Water Resources Board of California.)

1. Receipts including contributions and loans. The term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution:

A. 1951	$59,176.04
B. 1952	60,520.26
C. 1953	56,727.42
D. 1954	59,118.29
E. 1955	63,218.75

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$2,349.37
B. 1952	2,456.31
C. 1953	1,357.42
D. 1954	774.75
E. 1955	524.21

Colorado River Association (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of $500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951	$109,400.48
B. 1952	140,608.00
C. 1953	59,680.00
D. 1954	136,102.84
E. 1955	195,760.00

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$92,622.70
B. 1952	111,538.15
C. 1953	50,595.81
D. 1954	25,288.17
E. 1955	64,403.31

Six Agency Committee (where listed as organization filing; does not include where listed as employer of any individual filing).

1. Receipts (totals listed cover contributions of $500 or more), including contributions and loans (the term "contribution" includes anything of value such as a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, amount received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.), and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution):

A. 1951	$17,400
B. 1952	20,000
C. 1953	20,000
D. 1954	20,000
E. 1955	30,000

2. Expenditures (the term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure):

A. 1951	$26,280.72
B. 1952	22,269.96
C. 1953	17,821.35
D. 1954	17,938.55
E. 1955	32,231.36

Mr. Chairman, I am not an engineer and I will have to leave the feasibility or infeasibility of the great project structures to the gentlemen who are qualified by years of training and experience to evaluate these technical factors. They have demonstrated beyond doubt that the project is, from an engineering standpoint, sound. Neither am I a geologist, so I cannot testify as to the rock and soil formations that will be encountered. I do not know where the opponents of this project came by their beakers of so-called Chinle, and until these opponents started casting their straws in the wind, I am sure many people thought "Chinle" was the name of a well-known distributor of a product medically known as "spiritus frumenti." But this is all a part of our educational process, and it is sometimes necessary to lay these things out in the open where we can look at them in the interest of good legislation. The economic report shows the project sound—over 60 percent of the entire cost will be paid back with interest from the production of electrical energy.

WILL THE PROJECT ADD TO THE FARM SURPLUSES?

I am prepared, however, to testify on the two fundamental problems involved in the upper Colorado project. First, the problem of farm surpluses, and, second, the problem of money.

In the past months we have become increasingly aware of the detrimental effect of surplus crops on the national farm income. The Government owns or is the first mortgagee on crops worth more than $8 billion, and every individual in Government is looking around for someone or something at which to point an accusing finger of blame. More often than not, reclamation projects have been singled out as the villain. But, gentlemen, nothing could be further from the truth. Reclamation adds no more to the surplus than a cap gun does to a shooting war.

The opponents of reclamation would have you believe that the great Federal irrigation projects are causing a terrible economic crisis among the farmers that will lead to their bankruptcy. But they do not cite you to any facts and figures to show just how much of this surplus is produced on irrigated lands. There is a very good reason for that, because except in terms of generalities, the argument falls very flat.

In 1954, only 0.35 percent of the 3 billion bushels of corn, and only 1.7 percent of the 970 million bushels of wheat in the United States, came from lands served by federally irrigated projects. A great part of these surplus grains were grown on dryland farms in areas blessed with adequate rainfall. They did not come from irrigated lands. Three States—Iowa, Illinois, and Minnesota—produced most of the corn and they are not irrigated; very little wheat is irrigated. Corn raised on irrigation projects is generally fed to livestock.

The irrigated West produces almost all of the Nation's apricots, almonds, walnuts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives. It grows 95 percent of the grapes, 90 percent of the lettuce, 75 percent of the avocados, pears, and cantaloupe. Indeed, it would be unusual to have ample supplies of fruits and vegetables without the great production from the irrigated West.

SURPLUSES OF TODAY MAY BE SHORTAGES OF TOMORROW

When we think of surplus crops, we should also remember that it takes about 10 years to develop a good reclamation district. We should also remember that our population will increase about 3 million yearly. These people will require food. Indeed, the diet of the American people in the world has changed a great deal in the last 25 years. The average person in the United States is eating more of a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables than ever before. It is estimated that more than 200 different farm commodities are in active use on the American table. Many are ample because of irrigation. We are eating 3 times as much citrus fruit as we did 20 years ago and 4 times as many carrots.

The children of today are bigger and taller than they were 25 years ago, all because of an ample diet containing all of the vitamins for good health.

Agricultural experts predict that in 10 years we will need an additional 35 million acres of land upon which to grow the meat that we presently consume. The American people should face reality or we will not escape the horrible nightmare of a shortage of food in the very near future.

It was only 11 years ago that the House of Representatives had a committee investigating the shortage of food. There was a shortage of meat, poultry, wheat, and the things American people enjoy having on their tables. That could happen again. Indeed, if surplus empty stomachs had all the food they need there would be no surplus of crops today.

VALUE OF IRRIGATION

As the House of Representatives begins its debate on the upper Colorado River development, I am sure that many of my colleagues will want information about the value of irrigation. It is right and proper that questions be asked, such as, Why bring more land under production when we have a surplus of crops today; or, How much is this country investing in irrigation power projects? Where does the money come from? How much money has been paid back? In fact, does irrigation pay—is it necessary?

I know some of you will say, "Congressman MILLER, we will meet that crisis when we come to it." I say, "We cannot sit back and wait." We better start crossing the bridge now and the bridge of more production in this case is reclamation and irrigation. In order to cross that productive bridge later, we must proceed to develop millions of additional acres through irrigation. The problem of producing food and fiber are growing side by side with the expanding population. The arid West needs to stabilize their economy and minimize the shock that comes with crop failure. The people in the arid West realize that they must make good use of their water supplies. They realize that water on good lands brings new wealth and a security so necessary to a growing, dynamic America. To me it is utterly foolish that this Nation, facing agricultural shortages, would sit back idly on a river or creek bank and watch the water run to the sea, when it should be used for irrigation and power. Remember it takes years to develop raw land with good irrigation projects. Some lands under the Colorado River project will take 30 years to bring into production.

It should also be realized that during the last 15 years, croplands have disappeared, some through erosion, and being taken out of production by the Federal Government for building military plants. About 15 million acres of tillable land was taken out of production because it was swallowed up by expanding cities, building of new plants, new highways, parks, and airports.

WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM FOR RECLAMATION?

Reclamation came into existence when Theodore Roosevelt signed the law in 1902, which provided establishment of a Bureau of Reclamation and included a provision for financing Federal undertakings through a revolving fund to be established within the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the reclamation fund.

In the beginning, the fund was supported by the proceeds from the sale of public lands. It was later augmented by a percentage of the royalties from oil holdings and of certain minerals in the United States. It was intended that revenues from these sources, plus revenues derived from repayment of project construction costs, would provide sufficient funds to continue construction of new projects. However, it became evident that the fund was not adequate to

undertake major construction projects, and since 1930 appreciable appropriations have been made from general funds of the Treasury, in addition to appropriations from the reclamation fund. Income to the fund is derived from accretions and collections. Accretions to the reclamation fund include 96 percent of the revenues from the sale of public lands, 52½ percent of the revenues from oil leases, 52½ percent of the revenues from royalties and rentals from potassium leases, and 50 percent of the revenues from FPC waterpower licenses. The income to the reclamation fund from collections results from construction and operation and maintenance repayments on reclamation projects. To date, over $1,006,580,000 has been appropriated from the reclamation fund. For fiscal year 1956, the amount of $89,510,000 out of a total of $170,791,000 appropriated for the reclamation program will come from the reclamation fund.

It is estimated that in another 10 years all the funds for reclamation will come from the revolving fund which is made up of revenue from the sale of public lands, oil leases, and so forth.

MONEY RETURNED TO THE TREASURY

Up to last year, Reclamation had repaid over $600 million to the reclamation fund and during the present fiscal year approximately $60 million more will be returned to the Government from the contracts entered into by water users.

Since 1902, about $2.8 billion has been allocated to reclamation and power projects. Irrigation has used $1.3 billion; industrial and municipal power $1,130 million; flood control $207 million. You will note that of the total amount, about one-half is charged to irrigation. All of the money is returned to the Treasury except that attributed to flood control's $207 million.

It is interesting to note that flood-control projects have received about 3 times the amount of money that has come to reclamation. Every State in the Union and nearly every community has had some benefit from flood-control moneys. These moneys pay back not one cent to the Federal Treasury in either interest or principal. The reclamation moneys pay back the principal. Money allocated to power projects pay back both interest and principal.

WATER IN STORAGE

The reservoir capacities in our reclamation dams would store 9.2 million acre-feet of water. This amount is sufficient to cover the State of Maryland with about 13 feet of water or Pennsylvania with 3 feet of water. This water is used on about 70 projects to produce crops, generate power, and take care of municipal and industrial water needs. The reclamation dams produce hydroelectric capacities sufficient to serve a nonindustrial city of almost 9 million people.

RETURN FROM POWER

The net power revenue in the fiscal year of 1955 from 34 Bureau of Reclamation powerplants, after deductions for annual operation, maintenance, and replacement, totaled $31.3 million. Total net power revenue returns to the Treasury through June 30, 1955, amounted to $257.2 million. Crops produced in 1954 from 69 projects was valued at $865 million and the total value from the beginning of irrigation now totals $10.6 billion.

The Federal tax revenue since 1916 from reclamation areas which can be attributed to Federal reclamation developments is estimated to total about $4.5 billion. This land, my friends, would be almost worthless without good water and without the people working the land.

The retail sales in the 17 Western States totals more than $43 billion in 1954. Much of this can be attributed to the income from the soil.

IRRIGATION—NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., PROJECT

I want to point out, particularly, one irrigation project with which I am well acquainted. The North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska. Here is a report on an area that would be practically worthless without water being placed upon the land:

1. Irrigated land outproduces comparable dry-farmed land 13 times. Approximately 68 percent of total cropland in the dry-land area is used to produce wheat as compared to less than one-half of 1 percent in the irrigated area.

2. The irrigated area comprising 10 percent of a 4-county area produces 91 percent of the income.

3. Land values in the irrigated area are 7 times greater than adjacent dry land.

4. The irrigated area supports 27 times more people and provides 40 times more income as adjacent dry areas of equivalent size.

5. With irrigation the property tax revenues have grown twentyfold.

6. Federal tax revenues per acre in the irrigated area, in 1953 were 33 times greater than for the adjacent dry-land area. Federal taxes which arise out of the irrigated area and its towns total about $16 million annually or more than two-thirds the cost of building the project.

7. Adjacent prairie areas lost 12 percent and the irrigated area gained 18 percent in population during the drought and depression years 1930–40.

8. The irrigation farmers spend about $50 million annually for materials, fuel, and machinery which come from other parts of the Nation.

9. Approximately 72 percent of all reimbursable project costs have been returned to the Federal Treasury. Repayments are being made on schedule.

10. Project farms have produced crops worth 20 times the cost of building the project.

NEW WEALTH PRODUCED

It should be remembered that all of this production from federally operated reclamation projects calls for the shipment of crops and livestock which creates an income for transportation; processing; milling; manufacturing; wholesaling and all of the processes between the farm and the consumer. The steer that is produced and fed on an irrigated farm in the North Platte Valley might be finished in the feed-lots of Iowa, butchered and processed in Chicago and fed to the people of New York City. It is all a way of creating wealth, of creating jobs. It means purchase power for farmers and others whose livelihood depends on production. New wealth means those who produce and process the food from the farm to the table can buy shoes; vacuum cleaners; refrigerators; washing machines, radios and a million items manufactured and produced in the industrial East. I say this, my colleagues, because you in the eastern part of the country should derive a great benefit from the new wealth created from irrigation projects. Water is the life blood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time brings a feeling of security, confidence, and new wealth to a community.

ENDORSED BY PAST PRESIDENTS

President Hoover had this to say about the justification of irrigation:

The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

The development of reclamation and power projects has been in the platform of the major political parties for many years. President Truman and President Eisenhower have endorsed the upper Colorado River storage project. It is a bipartisan matter.

YEARS TO DEVELOP

In the development of the upper Colorado River Basin, two-thirds of the money is allocated to power. Every cent of this will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest. The part earmarked for irrigation is important. It will take 10, 20, or maybe 30 years to develop some of these projects. We should plan today, not for your benefit or mine, but for the benefit of future generations. Water is becoming a more and more valuable resource. It should not be permitted to run to the ocean without first being used.

WATER IS NEEDED IN THE WEST

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, confidence and new wealth to a community. If we are to eat in the future, we will need to produce more crops.

Before the upper Colorado River project can be completed, we will have more than 250 million people living in the United States. These people will need jobs, they will need food, they will be a part of a growing, dynamic America. Unless you and I have some vision today, these people may not be doing so well 50 years from now.

I call your attention to the inscription cut in stone over the Speaker's table. Have a look at this quotation carved in stone:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. (Daniel Webster.)

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I fail to find in either of the two reports issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that is, the one issued last year when this bill was reported first and the supplemental report issued on the bill that is now before the House in the nature of a substitute, I fail to find the opinion and the criticism of the Director of the Budget.

I do find the Budget Director's opinion of the bill in the Senate report. The report of the Director of the Budget is dated March 17, 1955. Is it true, and I presume it is true, that the House Interior Committee had before it the same Budget Director's report as the Senate committee had?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true. These are words that should be burned into the hearts of the individual who sometimes feels that irrigation and reclamation projects do not pay. We should not be shortsighted and think just of today. We have to think of tomorrow and the future. What are you going to do to take care of future generations?

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Having established the fact that the Budget Director's report does not appear in either of the House committee reports on this bill, may I ask the gentleman whether it is true as set forth in the report of the Budget Director of March 17, 1955, that in the absence of detailed planning reports for certain projects now contained in this bill——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is that the report of the other body?

Mr. DONOVAN. I am reading the Budget Director's report to the Senate side. Is it true that the Budget Director says or reported that for certain reasons the Budget Director believes that the authorizations for Flaming Gorge, in this bill, Curecanti, in this bill, Navaho, in this bill—Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects, all in this bill, should be deferred until the necessary information as to their feasibility justifying their presence in this bill has been submitted to the Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, to answer that.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague. The language just read is in the letter to which the gentleman from New York makes reference. Also, in that letter is the statement, the one, perhaps, which found in favor of Echo Park instead of the Flaming Gorge units. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill gives a conditional authorization to Curecanti and, therefore, Curecanti is still in accordance with the budget message. This bill does not add anything for Navaho participating projects except to state that it is one of the projects to be planned and to be surveyed and reported back. This bill does provide that Navaho Dam, as such, which is not the facility referred to by the gentleman from New York will be authorized and built and paid for out of surplus new power revenues in the upper basin. In other words, the only project in this bill which seems to go counter in any way at all to what the gentleman has referred to is that of Flaming Gorge, and since that report has been written, we have been advised, and I understand the advice will come to us later, that the administration, which speaks higher than the budget, is in favor of the bill proposed by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The proponents of the proposed legislation are insisting that the approval of this measure will not create competition with, or increase, the surpluses on hand. What in the world are they going to grow out there if they do not grow products similar to those which we have today in surplus, or may help to create surpluses in the future?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman will find that alfalfa and a good many of the feed crops are not in surplus. We are willing to accept an amendment to be offered by your colleague from Kansas in which that is rather clearly spelled out.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield further, it so happens that there will be no participating projects other than, perhaps, the Paonia project, which can be brought anywhere near production within the 10-year period. If you take into consideration the development that means there will not be any of these projects which will be in violation of what the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Are we assured then that as far as wheat and other basic crops are concerned that this project will not compete with those crops? I understand the projects proposed in this bill are not specifically for the production of power. As I understand the measure it provides a little more than two-thirds, power and a little less than one-third for irrigation. I want to make sure none of this expenditure is charged to the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman agree with me—and I am reading the actual language of the Budget Director and the only evidence of a position by the Budget Director on this bill, language from the report of March 17, 1955:

> For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama and the Navaho participating programs should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress and the budget.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is an answer to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, 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. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a recent press report of Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., the New England division engineer.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have been greatly concerned about conditions in my district, State, and area arising from the devastating floods of last summer and fall. There is a great deal of work to be done regarding rehabilitation and protection, which will require the assistance of the Federal Government, and I am happy to see that the Congress has already acted in order that a sound beginning may be made on programs designed to this end.

General Fleming is an authority on floods and flood-control work and his warning expressed in the article clearly indicates that New England is in a precarious situation and, if any further floods should occur before protective measures have been completed, additional, enormous damage will be done. It is for this reason that I have been urging the utmost speed in carrying out flood-control projects necessary to control raging waters of seasonal storms and spring freshets.

I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by General Fleming and believe that they will be informative to Members of the Congress, as well as useful in enabling all of us to have a better understanding of the danger, which only prompt action by the Congress, looking toward the completion of necessary flood protection, can avert.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 19, 1955]

NEW FLOOD THREAT SEEN NEXT SPRING

BOSTON, MASS., November 18.—Flood-scarred New England will be in for more trouble in the spring if any early hard winter freezes waters at their present level, the Chief of Army engineers in the region said today.

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., spoke at a meeting on flood control problems during the closing day of the 31st annual conference of the New England Council at the Hotel Statler here. He said: "I don't want to be an alarmist, but, if we get an early freeze before a substantial amount of water has a chance to run off, and if we get just a normal snow cover this winter, I think we're in for trouble in the spring."

STREAMS CLOGGED

General Fleming told the flood control meeting that New England streams and ponds are clogged and the region's water

table is extremely high due to the heavy rains of this fall.

General Fleming said that upstream reservoirs and channel improvements are the only two feasible weapons against floods in New England. Two other devices—protective dikes such as those at Hartford and selective flooding permitting unvaluable areas to flood to save other sections—have little usefulness in such a highly developed region, he said.

The General maintained that flood control dams in New England should be for that purpose only, and he criticized proposals which have been made in recent months that the power possibilities of such dams be exploited.

"Power and flood control in New England," he said, "are like oil and water—they just don't mix."

General Fleming explained that a flood control dam to be effective must be kept empty, and that a power dam, if it is to produce power, must be kept full. So-called multi-purpose dams in other parts of the country, he said, are actually a series of reservoirs in one dam. He said New England offers "only two possibilities" for multi-purpose dams from an engineering point of view, and "none from an economic point of view." He did not specify the two possibilities.

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 23, 1956, issue of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph entitled "GOP Harming Ike's Road Program":

GOP HARMING IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's highway program in Washington is suffering today from foot-dragging and sabotage from members of his own Cabinet.

Whether accidentally or by design, the performances of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks as witnesses before the House Ways and Means Commitee definitely lessened the chances of passage of a highway bill that will carry out the President's program.

The position taken by Humphrey perhaps can be rationalized to be that simply of a treasurer desiring to balance his books whether any roads are built or not.

The position of Secretary Weeks was just plain baffling.

The committee heard Weeks because he has supervision of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Weeks read a long prepared statement praising those sections of the highway bill with which the committee has no responsibility and very little concern.

He was then questioned on the tax features of the bill, which are totally the concern of the committee and were presumably the reason for Weeks' appearance.

The Secretary had no advice and no counsel.

He was unable to answer questions that almost everybody in the room, including the spectators, could have answered readily.

Not only did he not know the answers, he refused to let two officials of the Bureau of Public Roads give the answers themselves.

It was more than sheer ignorance.

It was obvious to everyone present that Weeks was not going to help the Democrats write a tax bill to finance the Eisenhower highway program.

If the Eisenhower program is voted down in the House because of lack of Republican support, the blame can be traced directly to the attitude shown by Humphrey and Weeks.

They were negative witnesses.

Apparently the President will have to state his position again.

He will have to state it bluntly and specifically so that no one will confuse his position with that taken by his two Cabinet members.

He has said already that he will support a highway bill financed by higher taxes, and in saying so he attempted to make the bill bipartisan.

At least that is the way everybody but Humphrey and Weeks saw it.

Their actions have served only to confuse those Republicans who will have to vote on the bill.

They are wondering which administration position is the official one.

The Weeks' performance looked particularly bad because he was preceded as a witness by a Republican who intelligently and enthusiastically supported the highway bill and its tax schedule.

He was Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati, and a brother of the late United States Senator Robert Taft.

Taft disagreed with previous testimony given by Humphrey and certainly will disagree wtih the position taken by Weeks.

The facts are that a Republican Ohio mayor did more to advance the Eisenhower highway program, for which he has no responsibility, than the two responsible Cabinet officers put together.

The Sun-Telegraph and the other Hearst Newspapers regard it as of vital importance that the President again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a deep personal interest.

THE SHRIMP FISHERY OF THE GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, fishing for shrimp has become one of the major industries of Florida in recent years. Several thousands of our citizens who live in nearly every seaboard city in the State are engaged the year around in manning the vessels that catch the shrimp, in processing them for market, in distributing them to markets all over the country, and in supplying needed materials to the vessels and plants.

The fishery is an old one on both the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico sides of the State but it received a great impetus directly after the war when it was found that the so-called brown or pink shrimp which occasionally were found in the catches were abundant in deeper waters of the Gulf of Mexico than had theretofore been fished commercially. Not only were they abundant in these deeper waters but they were delicious and they found a quick and ready market in all parts of the United States. Under the impetus of this discovery the shrimp fishery has grown to be the most valuable sea fishery that the United States has, surpassing salmon some years ago and even becoming greater than tuna in the value of its landings last year.

To fish in these deeper waters whole new fleets of larger modern trawling vessels had to be built and financed from the catch. Their activities quickly spread out all over the high seas of the Gulf of Mexico wherever the bottom and water conditions were suitable for fishing and for supporting the shrimp they sought. Rather quickly it was found that some of the best shrimping grounds were in the southern part of the gulf off the coast of Mexico in the Campeche, Tampico, and adjacent areas of the high seas. These were seas well known to Florida fishermen who had fished for red snapper in that area for several generations, and still do.

While it was American fishermen from Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas who discovered and proved up these shrimp fisheries of the southern gulf it was not long before Mexican fishermen began to participate in these offshore fisheries too, as often as not with vessels, capital, and business experience provided by American partners. Since there was little or no market at the time for shrimp in that part of Mexico most of the Mexican-caught shrimp was exported to markets in the United States as it still is.

The Mexican fishery in the area developed rapidly as did the American fishery and as they developed side by side friction grew, as it often does in such circumstances. Part of this was due to normal competition on the fishing grounds and in the market. It was a new, dynamic, pioneer fishery and excesses of exuberant spirits were present on both sides. Smouldering in the background was the century-old dispute between the United States and Mexico as to where the territorial sea left off and the free high seas began. Mexico and the Gulf States claimed that the territorial sea in the gulf was 9 marine miles in breadth; the Department of State replied as vigorously that the territorial seas of all parties in the gulf were 3 marine miles in breadth. Aiding and confusing such friction as arose over this issue were claims made by Argentina, Chile, and Peru to total sovereignty over 200 miles or more of ocean off their coasts. If they could make such extravagant claims why could not Mexico do so too and drive the Americans completely out of the Gulf of Mexico south of the Rio Grande?

There was continued friction on the fishing grounds, heated articles in the Mexican newspapers and, finally, seizure of American vessels which drew the immediate attention of the Congress and the Department of State. It also called for quick reaction from the American shrimpers themselves. If American fishermen were going to be forced out of the fishery they had developed they would seek to close this American market to the Mexican product. It would be tit for tat. In early 1950, when the serious problems began to flare, bills were introduced into the Congress for that purpose.

But as quickly as the serious trouble flared it began to die down. There were wise heads in the industry on both sides of the border and in the spring of 1950 they decided to get their heads together and devise ways and means to all stay in business profitably. There were shrimp enough for both groups of fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico if some patience could be found. There was market enough in the United States to absorb the catches of both if they worked at it. As a matter of fact discussions did not get very far before it was found that they had more serious interests in common than they had disputes. There was need for a better merchandizing program to build up the market in the United States. There was need for both sides to improve the quality of their products and this was a joint problem because they were in the same market. There was need for biological and oceanographic research to learn more about the resources itself, so that overfishing could be avoided.

From this original meeting grew an organization which I think is without parallel in American relations and which deserves the plaudits of the public on both sides of the border. On the spot was formed the Shrimp Association of the Americas. The governing board of the organization was divided half and half between American and Mexican citizens in the shrimp business. Dues and assessments were apportioned on the basis of the volume of business transacted, whether by a Mexican or an American firm. Projects of mutual interest were to be undertaken.

To begin with the bills to bar shrimp imports from the American market were dropped and the hue and cry to drive the Americans out of the high seas off Mexico began to die down. Quality control projects were begun and have been carried on continuously since. Jointly sponsored advertising projects were devised and carried out. As time went on the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was persuaded to extend their biological and oceanographic research on shrimp in the entire gulf, and the Mexican Department of Fisheries helped as it could. Both sides pressed their governments to negotiate a conservation treaty of the sort that has been so usefully employed in the halibut, salmon, tuna, fur-seal, whale, and New England fisheries, and progress along this line is being made. Agents were hired by the association in Mexican ports so that vessels in distress or with injured crewmen could enter these ports without governmental friction. Work is under way to provide better storm and weather predictions.

In short the Shrimp Association of the Americas as composed exclusively of Mexican and American businessmen in the shrimp industry has in 6 short years shown more of the traditional spirit of inter-American cooperation and friendship and what can be accomplished on practical levels of human relationships than could have been reasonably expected by anyone in that short period of time, or than anybody on either side of the border would have guessed in the tense spring of 1950. True, problems keep coming up and friction still rises at times, but little of this has come from within the ranks of the industry on either side of the border, and in each case the Shrimp Association of the Americas has been able to meet the problem and relieve the friction.

But businessmen are businessmen whichever side of the border you are on, and diplomats are diplomats the world over. One is interested primarily in practice and the job of making income pay the bills, and the other is often more involved in policy and principle. Sometimes these paths lead in different directions and that appears to be the situation just now.

The Inter-American Council of Jurists concluded a meeting in Mexico City on the 5th of February just past. The council is made up of specialists in international law from each of the American Republics. Under the charter of the organization of American States it is supposed to work as a serious, technical body. I do not suppose that any of the delegates know much about the shrimp business, the Shrimp Association of the Americas, or how their deliberations over international law, or the lack thereof, could knock into a cocked hat the hard-won diplomatic victories of a group of hard-headed shrimp fishermen on both sides of the Rio Grande.

In the concluding session of the council's meeting a resolution was railroaded through with virtually no analysis, no study and no discussing. The United States and other delegations raised basic questions regarding the contents of the resolution but debate was choked off and no replies were made by the proponents. It was just voted, and the votes were counted before they were cast. The United States representative, the able William E. Sanders, had nothing he could do except file a strong reservation on behalf of the United States both as to the contents of the resolution and the high-handed methods used to put it across. I attach hereto copies both of the resolution and of the reservation filed by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am alive to the great issues of defense, security, and commerce which this action in Mexico City raises, and the difficulties that it throws in the way of a program of genuine inter-American cooperation in economic, social, diplomatic, and legal fields of our relations with our good neighbors to the south. But I must confess that at the moment I am more immediately concerned with the effect of this action on what I consider to be the splendid diplomatic accomplishments of these shrimp-fishing private citizens of both Mexico and the United States.

I do not suppose that this makes much difference to people outside the Gulf States, nor do I suspect that it weighs heavily in great affairs of state. But I do hope that these diplomats will find some way to work out their grave problems without further upsetting my shrimp fishermen, or causing them any more trouble than they deserve.

DECLARATION AND RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

For the reasons stated by the United States representatives during the sessions of committee I, the United States voted against and records its opposition to the Resolution on Territorial Waters and Related Questions. Among the reasons indicated were the following:

That the Inter-American Council of Jurists has not had the benefit of the necessary preparatory studies on the part of its permanent committee which it has consistently recognized as indispensable to the formulation of sound conclusions on the subject;

That at this meeting of the Council of Jurists, apart from a series of general statements by representatives of various countries, there has been virtually no study, analysis, or discussion of the substantive aspects of the resolution;

That the resolution contains pronouncements based on economic and scientific assumptions for which no support has been offered and which are debatable and which, in any event, cover matters within the competence of the specialized conference called for under resolution LXXXIV of the Tenth Inter-American Conference;

That much of the resolution is contrary to international law;

That the resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of States other than the adjacent coastal States in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective; and

That the resolution is clearly designed to serve political purposes and therefore exceeds the competence of the Council of Jurists as a technical-juridical body.

In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document.

RESOLUTION XIV, SYSTEMS OF TERRITORIAL WATERS AND RELATED QUESTIONS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

The Inter-American Council of Jurists suggests to the Council of the Organization of American States that it transmit to the specialized conference provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference the resolution entitled "Principles of Mexico on the Juridical Regime of the Seas" approved by this Council, together with the minutes of the meetings in which this subject has been considered during the third meeting, with the character of the preparatory study called for in topic I–a of its agenda, "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions."

(Approved at the fourth plenary session, February 3, 1956.)

RESOLUTION XIII, PRINCIPLES OF MEXICO ON THE JURIDICAL REGIME OF THE SEAS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF JURISTS, THIRD MEETING, MEXICO CITY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1956

Whereas the topic System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American

Conference Provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference was included by the Council of the Organization of American States in the agenda of this third meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists; and

Its conclusions on the subject are to be transmitted to the specialized conference soon to be held, the Inter-American Council of Jurisis recognizes as the expression of the juridical conscience of the contineut, and as applicable between the American States, the following rules, among others; and declares that the acceptance of these principles does not imply and shall not have the effect of renouncing or weakening the position maintained by the various countries of America on the question of how far territorial waters should extend.

A. TERRITORIAL WATERS

1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called "territorial waters" is justifiable.

2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense.

B. CONTINENTAL SHELF

The rights of the coastal State with respect to the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf extend also to the natural resources found there, such as petroleum, hydrocarbons, mineral substances, and all marine, animals, and vegetable species that live in a constant physical and biological relationship with the shelf, not excluding the benthonic species.

C. CONSERVATION OF LIVING RESOURCES OF THE HIGH SEAS

1. Coastal States, following scientific and technical principles, have the right to adopt measures of conservation and supervision necessary for the protection of the living resources of the sea contiguous to their coasts, beyond the territorial waters. Measures that may be taken by a coastal State in such case shall not prejudice rights derived from international agreements to which it is a party, nor shall they discriminate against foreign fishermen.

2. Coastal States have, in addition, the right of exclusive exploitation of species closely related to the coast, the life of the country, or the needs of the coastal population, as in the case of species that develop in territorial waters and subsequently migrate to the high seas, or when the existence of certain species has an important relation with an industry or activity essential to the coastal country, or when the latter is carrying out important works that will result in the conservation or increase of the species.

D. BASE LINES

1. The breadth of territorial waters shall be measured, in principle, from the low-water line along the coast, as marked on large-scale marine charts, officially recognized by the coastal State.

2. Coastal States may draw straight base lines that do not follow the low-water line when circumstances require this method because the coast is deeply indented or cut into, or because there are islands in its immediate vicinity, or when such a method is justified by the existence of economic interests peculiar to a region of the coastal State. In any of these cases the method may be employed of drawing a straight line connecting the outermost points of the coast, islands, islets, keys, or reefs. The drawing of such base lines must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coast, and the sea areas lying within these lines must be sufficiently linked to the land domain.

3. Waters located within the base line shall be subject to the regime of internal waters.

4. The coastal State shall give due publicity to the straight base lines.

E. BAYS

1. A bay is a well-marked indentation whose penetration inland in proportion to the width of its mouth is such that its waters are inter fauces terrae and constitute something more than a mere curvature of the coast.

2. The line that encloses a bay shall be drawn between its natural geographical entrance points where the indentation begins to have the configuration of a bay.

3. Waters comprised within a bay shall be subject to the juridical regime of internal waters if the surface thereof is equal to or greater than that of a semicircle drawn by using the mouth of the bay as a diameter.

4. If a bay has more than one entrance, this semicircle shall be drawn on a line as long as the sum total of the length of the different entrances. The area of the islands located within a bay shall be included in the total area of the bay.

5. So-called historical bays shall be subject to the regime of internal waters of the coastal State or States.

(Approved at the fourth plenary session, February 3, 1956.)

RESERVED POWERS OF THE STATES

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a joint resolution passed unanimously by the South Carolina General Assembly and signed by the Governor. This joint resolution condemns and protests the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the States and Congress to prevent this and other encroachment by the Central Government and declaring the intention of South Carolina to exercise all powers reserved to it, to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people

Mindful of its responsibilities to its own citizens and of its obligations to the other States, the General Assembly of South Carolina adopts this resolution in condemnation of and protest against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, and against the grave threat to constitutional government implicit in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, for these reasons:

1. The genius of the American Constitution lies in two provisions. It establishes a clear division between the powers delegated by the States to the Central Government and the powers reserved to the States, or to the people. As a prerequisite to any lawful redistribution of these powers, it establishes as a part of the process for its amendment the requirement of approval by the States.

The division of these powers is reaffirmed in the 10th amendment to the Constitution in these words: "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."

Long judicial precedent also clearly reaffirms that Central Government is one of delegated powers, specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and that all other powers of Government, not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.

The power to propose changes and the power to approve changes in the basic law is specifically stated by article V of the Constitution in these words: "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, which, in either 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, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

Lincoln, in his first inaugural, recognized these constitutional principles in the following language: "The maintenance inviolate to the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

2. Neither the judicial power delegated to the Supreme Court in article III of the Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as the article authorizes the Congress to confer upon the Court, makes the Court the supreme arbiter of the rights of the States under the compact.

3. The right of each of the States to maintain at its own expense racially separate public schools for the children of its citizens and other racially separate public facilities is not forbidden or limited by the language or the intent of the 14th amendment. This meaning of the 14th amendment was established beyond reasonable question by the action of the Congress in providing for racially segregated schools in the District of Columbia by legislation contemporaneous with the submission of the 14th amendment to the States in 1866, and by the fact that a majority of the States in the Union at that time recognized that segregation in public facilities had not been abolished by this amendment. There is no evidence in the Constitution, in the amendments, or in any contemporary document that the States intended to give to the Central Government the right to invade the sanctity of the homes of America and deny to responsible parents a meaningful voice in the training of their children or in the selection of associates for them.

4. For almost 60 years, beginning in 1896, an unbroken line of decisions of the Court interpreted the 14th amendment as recognizing the right of the States to maintain racially separate public facilities for their people. If the Court in the interpretation of the Constitution is to depart from the sanctity of past decisions and to rely on the current political and social philosophy of its members to unsettle the great constitutional principles so clearly established, the rights

of individuals are not secure and Government under a written Constitution has no stability.

5. Disregarding the plain language of the 14th amendment, ignoring the conclusive character of the contemporary actions of the Congress and of the State legislatures, overruling its own decisions to the contrary, the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, relying on its own views of sociology and psychology, for the first time held that the 14th amendment prohibited the States from maintaining racially separate public schools and since then the Court has enlarged this to include other public facilities. In so doing the Court, under the guise of interpretation, amended the Constitution of the United States, thus usurping the power of Congress to submit, and that of the several States to approve, constitutional changes. This action of the Court ignored the principle that the meaning of the Constitution and of its amendments does not change. It is a written instrument. That which the 14th amendment meant when adopted it means now (*South Carolina* v. *United States*, 199 U. S. 437, 449).

6. The educational opportunities of white and colored children in the public schools of South Carolina have been substantially improved during recent years and highly satisfactory results are being obtained in our segregated schools. If enforced, the decision of the Court will seriously impair and retard the education of the children of both races, will nullify these recent advances and will cause untold friction between the races.

7. Tragic as are the consequences of this decision to the education of the children of both races in the Southern States, the usurpation of constitutional power by the Court transcends the problems of segregation in education. The Court holds that regardless of the meaning of a constitutional provision when adopted, and in the language of the 1955 Report of the Gray Commission to the Governor of Virginia, "irrespective of precedent, long acquiesced in, the Court can and will change its interpretation of the Constitution at its pleasure, disregarding the orderly processes for its amendment set forth in article V thereof. It means that the most fundamental of the rights of the States or of their citizens exist by the Court's sufferance and that the law of the land is whatever the Court may determine it to be." Thus the Supreme Court, created to preserve the Constitution, has planted the seed for the destruction of constitutional government.

8. Because the preservation of the rights of the States is as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the National Government, since "the Constitution, in all of its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States" (*Texas* v. *White* ((1869), 7 Wallace 700, 725)), and since the usurpation of the rights reserved to the States is by the judicial branch of the Central Government, the issues raised by this decision are of such grave import as to require this sovereign State to judge for itself of the infraction of the Constitution.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. That the States have never delegated to the Central Government the power to change the Constitution nor have they surrendered to the Central Government the power to prohibit to the Sates the right to maintain racially separate but equal public facilities or the right to determine when such facilities are in the best interest of their citizens.

SEC. 2. That the action of the Supreme Court of the United States constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt to change the true intent and meaning of the Constitution. It is in derogation of the power of Congress to propose, and that of the States to approve, constitutional changes. It thereby establishes a judicial precedent, if allowed to stand, for the ultimate destruction of constitutional government.

SEC. 3. That the State of South Carolina condemns and protests against the illegal encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people and against the grave threat to the constitutional government implicit in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the States and the Congress do take appropriate legal steps to prevent, now and in the future, usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and other encroachment by the Central Government into the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people to the end that our American system of constitutional government may be preserved.

SEC. 5. In the meantime, the State of South Carolina as a loyal and sovereign State of the Union will exercise the powers reserved to it under the Constitution to judge for itself of the infractions and to take such other legal measures as it may deem appropriate to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people.

SEC. 6. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the governor and legislature of each of the other States, to the President of the United States, to each of the Houses of Congress, to South Carolina's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and to the Supreme Court of the United States for its information.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Governor.

In the senate house the 14th day of February.

In the year of our Lord 1956.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
President of the Senate.
SOLOMON BLATT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved the 14th day of February 1956.
GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, JR.,
Governor.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago a DC–3 took off at Long Beach, Calif., with 22 passengers for New York. This flight, unheralded at the time, was probably one of the most significant trailblazing episodes in postwar commercial aviation. That was the inauguration of air coach. The young war veterans who operated that flight developed North American Airlines, the independent enterprise which has had such great impact on the air-transportation industry in the past decade.

I salute the imagination and perseverance of these young men. Thanks to their willingness to face innumerable obstacles they have not only built a successful and important company, but they have made a vital contribution to all commercial aviation—and a real contribution to the American public. For them to have survived for 10 years in a field as difficult and as full of handicaps testifies both as to the ability of the North American organization, and to the demand of the traveling public which insisted upon low-cost service and supported it, despite elaborate efforts to dissuade anyone from using the independents.

But I am not here to sing the praises of any one airline or criticize or condemn any carrier.

What concerns me is our public policy. How wise, how practical, has our public policy been in regard to civil aviation? Has the Government shown foresight and prudence and real courage?

Everyone is aware of the difficult task Congress has always faced regarding the aviation subsidy. It is a problem which my colleagues and I have been faced with in our Appropriations Committee. I will not burden you with technical details, only these few simple figures: that in the 6 years following the war the Federal Treasury gave, to the airlines in the form of direct and indirect subsidy, an average of almost one hundred million dollars each year. This substantial figure did not solve the industry's problems. During a period when other businesses were booming, the certificated airlines suffered from a recession all their own. In 1946, the industry lost $5,367,000; in 1947, $14,256,000; and in 1948 lost $12,204,000. The major airlines, at that time, offered no low-cost, popular type of service. On the contrary, they had various super-deluxe flights at special premium fares which put added burdens on the Treasury. Their only answer to the problem was to come before Congress and request additional subsidy. In 1949 one airline president called for $90 million in the form of increased mail pay. A spokesman for the Air Transport Association stated before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1949:

> The fact remains, however, that the long-range growth in domestic airline passenger traffic halted (at least for the time being) abruptly and unexpectedly.

The industry took the position that aviation markets were drying up and only Government subsidy could keep them flying.

At this very time, the independent industry, led by the North American management, was growing at a rapid rate and growing without a cent of Government subsidy. They were earning substantial profits and plowing these profits back into equipment and expansion. They were accused of skimming the cream, but survey after survey showed that they had discovered a vast new market by ignoring the cream and developing the skim milk—the middle-income group. Thus they created a real mass market.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that the CAB, the regulatory agency, did not direct or lead or shape the new development. The Board remained laggard and was only impelled to move when air coach was an accomplished fact. Then the CAB was confronted with the application to grant certification to the only operators of air coach—the independent. The Board did not grant such certification, denying it in the Transcontinental Coach case. This refusal was roundly castigated in an historic dissent by member Adams who wrote that the Board's action was "merely further evidence of the refusal of the majority to recognize and satisfy a public need, now,

which has been demonstrated by the facts and record in this case." But the Board could not deny or ignore the proven success of air coach. The public demand was clear. So, after a private conference with the CAB, the major airlines offered a few coach flights on the transcontinental run late in 1951.

Success was instantaneous. The increase in coach traffic has advanced more rapidly than all other phases of traffic. Profits have been substantial. Today we must pay special tribute to North American and the other pioneers of the low-cost field, because they showed how to wean the industry off of subsidy. This achievement has saved the Government millions of dollars and has brought additional service to millions of passengers. Aviation has become the fastest growing industry—and this year almost half the traffic will be air coach.

North American has virtually been the yardstick, establishing the rate criteria for all air coach. In 1953 North American reduced its transcontinental fares from $99 to $80. Last fall the certificated carriers adopted identical rates, for a 6-month period. It is interesting to note their experience. I quote from Aviation Daily:

TWA SAYS COACH EXCURSION FARE CATCHES ON

Trans World Airlines' transcontinental tourist traffic has increased "nearly 60 percent since inauguration of the $80 midweek excursion coach fare," according to TWA Sales Vice President E. O. Cocke. Actual gain for the fourth quarter of 1955, Cocke said, was 58.9 percent over the same 1954 period. "Preliminary figures for December," he added, "indicate the gain in volume * * * is directly attributable to the new excursion fare inaugurated by TWA on September 12." Special fare applies Monday through Thursday each week for round trips completed within 30 days.

I repeat, my interest is directed toward examining our public policy. Did the CAB follow sound doctrines or did it not in administering the mandate of Congress?

We cannot find that the Board was perceptive or alert to the aircoach possibilities. Moreover, when we look behind this we find an even more serious thing, that the CAB was engaged in formulating a deliberate policy to eliminate the very people who were developing aircoach—the very people whose ingenuity was responsible for getting the industry off of subsidy.

I am referring to a memorandum dated September 16, 1948, prepared by the Chief of the CAB's Bureau of Economic Regulations. This document sets forth in the most cynical language how the independent carriers could be eliminated without laying the Board "open to criticism of stamping out, without due process, these carriers which they have permitted to come into being." The memorandum sets up a choice whereby the independent is trapped, and ultimately put out of business, either by economic strangulation or by regulatory execution.

This document, the so-called Goodkind memorandum, first came to light before Senator THYE's Select Small Business Committee in 1953. To date there has been no thorough inquest into exactly what has been going on inside the CAB during this period and how such a memorandum became the blueprint for CAB policy.

Properly, these are questions which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Small Business Committee, and the Antimonopoly Subcommittee might be concerned with.

Each year the CAB appears before us seeking subsidy. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am keenly interested. I would like to know what goes on in the mind of a Government agency when it attempts to kill those enterprises in an industry which are responsible for eliminating the subsidy, while at the same time the agency appears before Congress defending and urging subsidy.

I repeat, in closing, that I salute North American Airlines on the historic anniversary of the inauguration of air coach, and I devoutly trust that we, in Congress, will take such action in our respective committees to insure that the innovators, the pioneers, the men who risk and succeed will at least be given an opportunity to participate in the fruits of their labors.

FATHER JAMES G. JOYCE: MARTYR AND PATRIOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1955, at the townhall in my hometown of Clinton, Mass., a huge civic welcome home reception was tendered under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus to our distinguished fellow townsman, priest, martyr, and patriot, Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., who but a short time before had been released from an extended period of imprisonment by the Chinese Reds. At this very impressive reception which was largely attended by friends and admirers of Father Joyce, there were moving scenes of rejoicing and of thanksgiving to the Almighty for his liberation and safe return home.

Father Joyce is a member of the famed and ancient Dominican Order, and prior to his imprisonment by the unspeakable Chinese Reds had been a missionary in China for over 20 years. After the fashion of the Communist police state which represses every semblance of human liberty and exerts particular enmity toward religion and the religious, Father Joyce was arbitrarily seized while devoutly ministering his priestly duties, was placed under arrest and confinement for over 2 years.

During that time, he was held incommunicado and was not privileged to talk with anyone, not even to his guards, and then only when he was spoken to. He was not permitted to write letters, was furnished only enough food for bare subsistence and was visited with many indignities to his high calling and person.

Pursuant to the usual base, degenerate practices of the Communists, he was shamefully mistreated and brainwashed day after day—unjustly accused of espionage and plotting against the so-called People's Government in China with a persistency, force, and violence calculated to break down his resistance and designed finally to induce him to sign incriminating statements against himself and his religious colleagues.

Of course, anyone knowing Father Joyce would immediately understand that these efforts to break his iron will and indomitable spirit were doomed to failure before they began. With characteristic zeal and gallantry, with a God-given fortitude and courage that possibly could not be excelled, Father Joyce stanchly and successfully resisted all the threats, violence, intimidation, and punishment which the dastardly Red forces inflicted upon him. In the same dauntless way his colleagues, Father Hyde and Father Gordon, who were confined with him refused to yield to Red domination, and together with Father Joyce they thus followed the finest traditions of the dedicated religious of their faith and adhered to the highest and most exacting standards of American patriotism.

Father Joyce and his colleagues proved something to the Chinese Reds which force of arms has as yet failed to do, and that is, that there is a greater force in this world than the physical—a force capable of standing up against greatest odds, capable of enduring torture and punishment beyond description in order to prove true, loyal, and devoted to the cause of God and country. That is the invincible force of the spirit that comes only from profound belief and faith in God.

His and theirs was a great victory over insidious godless elements who renounce all religious belief and who are the sworn enemies of freedom. It was a triumph of moral and spiritual courage over physical force and violence. It conclusively demonstrated to the Reds and to the world that while they may vilify and denounce, wrongfully accuse, imprison, and cruelly torture their innocent, helpless victims, that there are individuals associated with the free world who are so strong in their beliefs, so inflexible in their purpose, and so indomitable in their faith that their spirit can never be broken. That is the immortal saga of Father Joyce and his dauntless colleagues.

The town of Clinton where Father Joyce was born and reared is to a man, woman, and child inexpressibly proud of the inspiring example of Father Joyce. His family, friends, order, and country are very proud of him. But there is indeed a far greater significance to his experiences and his contributions. He stands before the Nation and the world as a peerless symbol of personal bravery, unfaltering loyalty and superlative faith. He is, in truth, an inspiration to all those who cherish freedom and mean to preserve it, if necessary with their own

lives. And the same is true, of course, of his colleagues.

The community that can claim Father Joyce, and the other men with him, as its own is fortunate and proud indeed. The Nation which claims him and them has a priceless possession of loyalty and stalwart patriotism which will fire and strengthen the national purpose of standing up courageously against the threats and blandishments of evil conspirators who would reduce the free world to serfdom and destroy the precious institutions of freedom and justice upon which our Nation is founded.

This episode of Father Joyce and his colleagues should prove to Communist leadership that there are forces in this Nation and in the free world which will never surrender their heritage of freedom, and will never, for any reason, give up its hard-won liberties.

It will indeed be the spirit, the courage and fortitude of Father Joyce, and men like him, which will, in the end, put tyranny and oppression to rout, and preserve our free way of life against brutal and ruthless enemies.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein several excerpts and newspaper articles throwing further light upon the great sacrifices, strength of character, nobility of purpose, gentility of spirit, profound reliance in the living God, and unsurpassed gallantry and patriotism of Father James Joyce and his colleagues.

It is not inappropriate to note here that while some of our own military personnel, well trained and especially doctrinated in Americanism cracked under terrible Communist mistreatment and torture that Father Joyce and his group stood firm, steadfast and unyielding in the face of harsh cruelty and brutality, and thus exemplified a most glorious page in American history as well as in the great religious order to which they have the honor to belong, and which they themselves so distinctly honor.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 12, 1955]

PRIEST WELCOMED HOME FROM RED CHINA PRISON

CLINTON.—More than 500 townspeople expressed feelings of rejoicing and thanksgiving to welcome home one of their priests from Communist imprisonment at a reception at Fallon Auditorium Sunday night.

Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., told the well-wishers their prayers helped to sustain him during his solitary confinement in China. He described his imprisonment and thanked the townspeople for their faith.

GIFTS PRESENTED

Representatives of the clergy, town, and national governments and the Knights of Columbus, which sponsored the reception, filled the stage with the white-robed priest. Speakers expressed the thanks of the townspeople at his safe return and praised his fortitude under the torture devised by his captors.

A chalice inscribed with a Celtic cross and a check to aid him on his expressed desire to visit Ireland were presented to Father Joyce by Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the reception. The gifts resulted from donations of townspeople collected by the K. of C. since his release in Hong Kong in September.

Father Joyce described the arrest in August 1953, which began his solitary confinement in a 10-foot-square room where he was to spend 25 months. Locked in separate rooms in the same house were two other priests of his order who were later freed with him.

TORTURE DESCRIBED

Efforts of the Communists to break the will of the priests and force them to confess to spying for the United States Government were also described with feeling by the missionary.

"Those 25 months sound bad and they were bad," he said. "But for men of God, it was a wonderful experience.

"It was wonderful to be so close to Him. We could almost see the Holy Family in there with us, and after all they had little better than we had, at Nazareth. The religious and spiritual experience was wonderful."

SPIRITUAL LIFE ENRICHED

Their spiritual life was enriched, he said, by reciting parts of the mass they could remember, their rosaries, and their breviaries.

Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, expressed the greetings of the missionary's home parish. "He did it for the love of God and he was ready to suffer more to bring Christ to the people of China. We are grateful to Almighty God that he has been spared and returned to us."

Paul P. Lavelle, chairman of selectmen, told the audience that Father Joyce's experience shows the nearness of world events to the people of Clinton.

United States Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN called Father Joyce's experience an inspiration for the Nation. He decried what he said was a move among some governments to admit the Red Chinese to the United Nations despite treatment given to such as Father Joyce.

Praise for his Christian fortitude was given the missionary by Rev. Frances J. Carroll, pastor of Our Lady of the Rosary parish. "We are proud of the Christian steadfastness you have shown," he said.

Other speakers introduced by Austin J. Kittredge, master of ceremonies, were Rev. James McLarney, of the Dominican province of St. Joseph; Judge William P. Constantino, and Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery of West Hartford, Conn., and a native of Clinton.

Music was played by an orchestra assembled by John H. Flannagan and vocal selections were given by St. John's Church choir under direction of Mrs. T. Francis McDonald. Francis C. McDonald, grand knight of Clinton Council, K. of C., opened the ceremonies.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of December 12, 1955]

CLINTON'S FATHER JOYCE RECOUNTS HIS FAITH AGAINST RED SLAPS

CLINTON, December 12.—This town paid tribute to a courageous native son with a joyous testimonial to Rev. James G. Joyce in Fallon Auditorium Sunday night.

More than 500 townspeople joined with clergy, Government officials and the Knights of Columbus to express their thanksgiving for the return of the Dominican missionary.

Father Joyce was released from nearly 5 years' imprisonment in Communist China in September. He returned here last month.

A check to aid the priest fulfill a desire to visit Ireland and a chalice inscribed with a Celtic cross were presented to the Clinton missionary by the Clinton Council, Knights of Columbus, which sponsored the reception. The gifts were raised from donations of townspeople.

Father Joyce, wearing the white robes of his order, thanked the audience for their prayers which he said helped to sustain him during 25 months' solitary confinement. He also told the assembly the treatment at the hands of his Communist captors was a wonderful experience for a man of God.

WIT SNAPS GRAVITY

Despite the seriousness of his testimony, the priest often broke the audience into laughter with his good-natured witticisms.

His solitary confinement began, he told the audience, in August 1953 when he and two other Dominican missionaries were locked in separate 10-foot-square rooms in a small house. He described efforts of their captors to break the will of the priests and force them to confess to spying for the United States Government.

The Communists would list a lot of charges against him, Father Joyce said, and when he said they were false they would slap his face.

"They said they offered us a road to peace and freedom or a road to our little rooms," he said, "We would tell them they were giving us the road to Hell."

When his captors threatened to take him out and shoot him the priest told them to go ahead, he said.

"Those 25 months sound bad and they were bad," the missionary said with sincerity. "But for men of God it was a wonderful experience.

"CLOSE TO HIM"

"It was wonderful to be so close to Him. We could almost see the holy family in there with us, and after all they had little better at Nazareth than we had. The religious and spiritual experience was wonderful," he said.

During their confinement the missionaries, each in his separate cell, enriched their spiritual life by reciting portions of the mass, the rosary, and their breviaries, he explained.

"All of these were helpful, along with your prayers, in keeping us sane," he said, adding with characteristic good humor, "That is if I am sane."

The missionaries thought they were on their way to execution, he said, when they were brought before the judge who ordered them expelled from China.

With a voice that began to grow husky toward the end of his off-the-cuff talk, the missionary expressed confidence in the vigor of Chinese catholicism.

"Their faith grows stronger and stronger all the time," he said. "China is a sanctified country."

First of the speakers to express his thanks at the homecoming was Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, the missionary's home parish.

"He did it for the love of God and he was ready to suffer more to bring Christ to the people of China. We are grateful to Almighty God that he has been spared and returned to us," he said.

Paul B. Lavelle, chairman of selectmen, said the priest's experiences "show how the events of the world have a personal effect on our lives."

United States Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN called Father Joyce "one of the most distinguished native sons to come from this town as well as an international and national hero."

Other speakers introduced by Austin J. Kittredge, master of ceremonies, were Rev. Francis J. Carroll, pastor of Our Lady of the Holy Rosary Parish; Rev. James McLarney, of the Dominican Province of St. Joseph; Judge William P. Constantino; and Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery, of West Hartford, Conn., and a native of Clinton.

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of December 12, 1955]

FATHER JOYCE HONORED AT RECEPTION ON SUNDAY

"Our faith became stronger as our persecution continued," Rev. James G. Joyce, O. P., told a large gathering of townspeople, distinguished clergymen, town officials, and national figures, at the joyful welcome home

celebration held in his honor at Fallon Memorial Auditorium on Sunday night.

The beloved Dominican missionary and native Clintonian, who had been held captive by the Chinese Communists for 25 months, expressed his deep regard for the people of Clinton, and for all his other friends, whose constant prayers during his incarceration, were responsible he claimed for his freedom today.

DESCRIBES IMPRISONMENT

Father Joyce described his imprisonment and solitary confinement and the constant attempts of his captors to make him confess to trumped up charges of spying. "We have a bullet reserved for you," they told him, "but if you confess we will give you your freedom."

He described his confinement with two other missionaries, of the same order, in separate small rooms, never allowed to speak, only to answer to endless interrogations which were accompanied by slaps across the face.

"It sounds bad," he said, and "it was bad, but for a man of God it was a wonderful experience to be so close to Him. The spiritual part was wonderful" he continued, "to have the love, grace, and peace of God in our hearts."

KNIGHTS PLAN PROGRAM

The celebration was planned by the members of the Father Joyce Class of Clinton Council, K. of C., assisted by the K. of C. members and local affiliates of Bishop O'Reilly Assembly Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus.

Among those seated on the stage with Father Joyce, who was dressed in his white Dominican robes, were Rev. Leon D. McGraw, pastor of St. John's Church, Rev. Geoffrey B. Hughes, Rev. Urbain J. Gionet, curates of St. John's parish, Rev. Francis J. Carroll, pastor of the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, Rev. Thomas J. Tunney, pastor of St. Richard's Church, Sterling, Rev. Edmund B. Haddad, administrator of St. Francis Xavier Church, Bolton, Rev. Leo A. Battista, assistant director of Catholic Charties, Worcester, Msgr. Francis L. Keenan of St. Michael's Church, Lowell, Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, C. P., vice rector of Holy Family Monastery, West Hartford, Conn., Rev. James McLarney of St. Mary's Priory, Dover, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Paul P. Lavelle, chairman the the board of selectmen, Francis C. McDonald, Grand Knight of Clinton Council K. of C., Judge William P. Constantino, Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the committee, and Attorney Austin J. Kittredge, mast of ceremonies.

"PROUD OF HIM"

Attorney Kittredge told the audience that no previous occasion when he was called upon as master of ceremonies, gave him such a feeling of elation or pleasure as to welcome home Father Joyce, "We are proud of him, glad that he has returned safely and we welcome him back to Clinton," he said.

EXTENDS PARISH GREETINGS

Father McGraw, in extending greetings from St. John's said, "the privation and suffering he endured, he did for the love of God and was ready to suffer even more to bring the name of Christ to the poor people of China. He is back from a living death and it is time for rejoicing. We are grateful to God he has been spared and may the length of his days be strengthened to carry on the work to which he has dedicated his life."

WELCOME FOR TOWN

Paul P. Lavelle, chairman of the board of selectmen, representing the townspeople, told the audience that Father Joyce's experience made us realize the joy and happiness of living in a small town.

He said, "We have emerged from a season of thanksgiving and are entering the holy season of rejoicing and good will. In this atmosphere I bring the warm greetings of the community to you, your family and your friends. Your experience has made us more keenly aware that matters of international treachery are not remote."

"This occasion," he concluded, "brings to mind the words of the happy song, 'So It's Home Again, Home Again, America for Me.' Welcome home Father Joyce."

GREETING OF PARISH

Father Carroll speaking for his parishioners said, "There is no distribution of parish lines in Clinton, I've noted when it comes to honoring someone for whom the town can be proud or who has achieved fame."

"We were just as interested in Father Joyce's welfare, we prayed as hard and it was with happiness and joy we received the news of his freedom from martyrdom," he added.

"Father Joyce has made the name of the community and church noteworthy throughout the Christian World," he concluded.

INTERNATIONAL HERO

Congressman PHILBIN told the audience, "We are here to welcome home an international hero. No one could have served with more zeal or faith despite the indignities and privations inflicted by the despicable enemies who incacerated our priests."

"They are liars, sadists, and murderers who defy God and man," he continued, "but in spite of their treachery they could not shake his shining faith and his love for his God and his country."

JOY AND GLADNESS

Father McLarnen expresed great joy and gladness for the return of Father Joyce to the safety and security of America and pointed out that his return is a great lesson to us who did not realize the tryanny and cruelity of people who do not know God.

WARNS OF ENEMY

Judge Constantino stressed the importance of vigilance at all times and an awareness of recognizing communism for what it is. "We are happy that we still have Father Joyce and may he enjoy years of good health in the service of God," he said.

PRESENTED CHALICE

Austin F. Sheridan, chairman of the committee, presented Father Joyce a beautiful chalice enscribed with a Celtic Cross and a check in behalf of the townspeople.

"Because of your pride in your Irish ancestry we have enscribed the chalice with a Celtic Cross," Mr. Sheridan explained in presenting the gift. He told Father Joyce the check could be used to aid in his expressed desire to visit Ireland.

Messages of regret at being unable to attend were sent by Rt. Rev. Msgr. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. Peter's Church, Worcester; Rev. Alexander J. Struczko, pastor of St. Mary's Church; and Congressman James G. Donovan, of New York, all of whom extended their best wishes to the guest of honor and the hope that he would be spared for many years to carry on his missionary duties.

MUSICAL PROGRAM

During the evening, an inspiring musical program was presented by John H. Flanagan, violinist, and an assembled orchestra with vocal selections by St. John's senior choir under the direction of Mrs. T. Frank McDonald. The choir was heard in two beautiful renditions, Thanks Be to God, and Juravit.

The impressive program was concluded with a prayer by Rev. Aloysius O'Malley, of the Passionist Order and native Clintonian.

MORE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR RESEARCH TO SAVE OUR TEETH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, what is the most prevalent disease in the United States?

Tooth decay.

Almost all persons suffer from oral disease at some time during their lives.

Seventy-five percent of the people who lose teeth, lose them because of pyorrhea.

Half of the adult population is wearing 1 or 2 full dentures, or plates, as a result of previous dental diseases.

Apart from all the pain and suffering that people endure because less than one-half the population receives adequate dental care, the financial cost to the Nation is huge. The civilian dental bill is $1½ billion. In addition, the Armed Forces require the services of 6,000 dentists, and the Department of Defense spends $100 million a year for dental health care for the military. Between 1948 and 1953, the Veterans' Administration spent a quarter of a billion dollars for the dental care of men and women who had once served in the uniform of their country. Not to mention the large sums being spent for dental care by State and local governmental agencies and institutions. The manufacture of toothpaste and toothpowder is big business in the United States.

Yet, in spite of all this money and effort, we are losing our natural teeth, are suffering from various oral infections, and, in general, are fighting a defensive battle against tooth decay.

The reason?

We are not spending enough money in research to get to the root of the problem.

The discovery that the fluoridation of domestic water supplies would reduce the incidence of dental decay by about two-thirds, is one of the most significant contributions of dental research.

Can some similar preventive procedure be found to slow the rising toll of periodontal disease?

Will there ever be a truly therapeutic dentifrice instead of those now being prematurely advertised?

Can the incidence of dental disease be reduced so that dental health care can be realistically included in health-insurance programs similar to Blue Shield and Blue Cross?

The answers depend upon basic scientific research and the money to support such research.

The American Dental Association, with 85,000 members of the 100,000-strong dental profession, is currently spending almost one-quarter million dollars in direct research efforts.

The 43 dental schools and 7 dental research centers have all they can do to make both ends meet. The facilities and staff needed to train dentists and dental hygienists tax their resources to the limit. The financing of adequate research is beyond their powers.

It was not until 1948 that the problem was recognized, and the National

Institute of Dental Research was created by the Congress of the United States.

During the current year, fiscal 1956, the total appropriation for the Institute is only $2,214,000, or the smallest budget of the seven National Institutes of Health.

Of this sum, only $421,000 is available for dental research projects, principally in schools. It is being spread thin to support 45 different projects. Since most of these require from 2 to 3 years to complete, the Institute can accept only about 15 to 20 new projects a year under the present budget. Actually, the schools and research centers have become so discouraged as a result of having their applications rejected time after time because of insufficient funds that they hesitate to spend the time necessary to prepare the detailed type of application required.

Where else can the public look for adequate support of dental research but to the Federal Government?

For the year beginning July 1, the American Dental Association is recommending an increase to $6,026,000 in the amount set aside for dental research.

This for the sake of national health and not to promote any individual's wealth.

To finance 265 additional projects, through grants to dental schools and other nongovernmental research centers.

However, under appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, for the fiscal year 1957, only $16,000 will be available for each of the Nation's 43 dental schools and 7 private research centers, for this purpose.

This neglect of dental research is sharply defined by the following comparison. In 1954, the Federal Government made research grants to each of the Nation's medical schools, averaging $692,000 for each school.

Not realizing the damaging effects of dental disease upon each person's general health.

One hundred thousand American dentists ask for a concerted attack upon this problem through the medium of Federal grants to promote dental research.

They are backed by every American who is subject to oral disease.

That includes practically everyone.

Six million dollars a year is so little to ask for research that will lead to the control and prevention of a common misery.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to speak briefly in behalf of the schoolchildren of the United States, and, more especially, those who are forced to attend school in crowded, inadequate, unsafe classrooms. There are nearly 900,000 children going to school in shifts because of teacher and classroom shortages. I am speaking of the elementary classroom shortage. There are 2,385,000 elementary and high-school pupils above the normal capacity of the buildings occupied. Schoolchildren in this country deserve more consideration. There are 30½ million pupils enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools this school year, and within the next 5 years this total figure will be more than 45 million. The $400 million proposed to be spent in direct aid a year for 4 years to help the States and local school districts in the construction of more adequate classrooms is actually only equal to the cost of operating the Defense Department for 2 weeks. Clearly, the school classroom shortage is becoming so great that it is now a Federal responsibility to aid the States and localities.

The facts about school building inadequacies and other serious problems of education were reported and discussed at the White House Conference on Education last November. Delegates attending this meeting from all over the country agreed—2 to 1—that the Federal Government should aid our public schools. A large majority of the delegates also favored more Federal funds for school construction. The whole meeting proved to me that the truth about the Nation's school problems is wanted. When the facts and figures are clearly presented and bear evidence that emergency action is needed, the people usually respond because they know what they want. There is no longer a question whether Federal aid is necessary—this has been answered. We know, and the Nation knows, that the rate of school construction must be increased. I feel that the House Rules Committee will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to discuss school construction at an early date. Many people ask me, "When will the Rules Committee give Congress an opportunity to discuss school legislation?" In view of the great need for this legislation throughout the country today, I wish to make an urgent plea to each member of that committee to bring this legislation before the House as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Powell amendment has not become the tail that wags the dog. Additional Federal legislation is not appropriate to this issue. It would be completely unnecessary because the Supreme Court's decision has declared the law of the land on this subject. The Court has also recognized the complications surrounding integration. So with deep insight into how long it would take this social problem to be worked out, the Supreme Court decision provided that the Federal court system should oversee the process. Federal aid for school construction is of paramount importance if we are to give children an equal opportunity in the years ahead. The approval of this program would be a major step in providing the scientists and technicians that we must have in the future for our defenses. As it has often been said, segregation cannot be abolished in schools that do not exist. Personally, I have confidence in the Supreme Court decision. Schoolchildren all over the Nation are in need of adequate places in which to go to school. We should not further complicate this problem and hinder their futures.

The Committee on Education and Labor authorized the expenditure of money to make a thorough survey of the school-building needs in the United States in 1950. Pursuant to that survey the United States Office of Education published a report in December 1953 which revealed the following:

In 1952 we had a million classrooms in use, but we needed 312,000 additional classrooms to house 8,881,000 children. Half of these children were going to school in obsolete buildings. A third of them were in overcrowded classrooms (taking 30 pupils to a room as a reasonable standard). The remainder represented the enrollment increase between 1951 and 1952.

Nearly a third of the children enrolled in 1952–53 were affected by the classroom deficit.

The national school facilities survey also disclosed some of the following unfavorable conditions under which American children were attending school. Thus, in 1952:

More than half of our classrooms were overcrowded (providing less than 30 square feet per elementary pupil and 25 square feet per high-school pupil).

Fourteen percent of our classrooms provided less than 15 square feet per pupil—a space 5 by 3 feet per child.

Two classrooms out of five had more than 30 pupils in them. Nearly 1 in 10 had more than 40 pupils.

Nearly half of all the school buildings surveyed (47 percent) were built before 1922.

More than 1 building in 5 was over 50 years old. In the mid-20th century, 1 child in 10 was going to school in a 19th century building. Two children out of five were in buildings that did not meet minimum fire safety requirements.

According to ratings by State and local survey teams, 1 out of 5 pupils in 1952–53 was housed in school plants ready to be abandoned and replaced; 2 out of 5 were housed in buildings which needed to be modernized and rehabilitated; only 2 out of 5 were in satisfactory school buildings.

Seven hundred thousand children were on double sessions: 1½ million were going to class in rented buildings or in buildings not designed for school use. (The figures above are derived from the December 1953 Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey published by the United States Office of Education.)

We must fulfill the Federal Government's responsibility to the children of this Nation. Our schools can no longer be neglected. There are enough glaring examples of inadequate schools throughout the length and breadth of this land to emphasize the need for more adequate financing to alleviate an impending disaster. Accepting this emergency as first in national importance, Congress is called upon to enact legislation marking the beginning of a new period of better understanding that our Federal system is one of partnership based upon a willingness to cooperate in measuring up to national problems affecting all the people. Together we accept the truths that the American schools are in serious trouble throughout the Nation. The Committee on Education and Labor worked for months on this legislation last year. Again I urge that Congress be given a chance to act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I placed in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this date a story appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Reds Gear Schools To Win Cold War" by Marquis Childs. I feel that the membership of the House will be interested in Mr. Childs' column on the subject of schools. This Congress must act on this vital issue.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, that the special order granted him for today may be vacated and that he may have a special order for tomorrow for 60 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. LANE, for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include in his remarks of today and tomorrow in Committee of the Whole in the debate on H. R. 3383 certain pertinent material, including sections of statutes, statements of witnesses, newspaper articles, summaries, graphs, tables, and various papers, each germane to the legislation to be considered.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DAGUE and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to revise and extend the remarks he makes in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain charts.

Mr. COLE.

Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WHARTON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY), for 3 weeks, on account of health.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler.

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of regret that I announce to my colleagues of the House the death of our senior United States Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable HARLEY MARTIN KILGORE, who died early today at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md. The 63-year-old West Virginia Democrat, serving his third term in the United States Senate, succumbed at 2: 23 a. m. of a cerebral hemorrhage incident to high blood pressure.

Senator KILGORE, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, made an intensive inspection tour of Europe and the Middle East last fall. He became ill in Madrid and was hospitalized for high blood pressure. Upon his return to Washington he went to Key West, Fla., for a rest.

The Senator returned to his duties 2 weeks ago. Following a slight stroke he was again hospitalized at the naval hospital where early reports were he was improving. But on last Saturday he suffered a relapse and passed away this morning from a cerebral hemorrhage.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE was born in Brown, Harrison County, W. Va., January 11, 1893, the son of Quimby Hugh Kilgore and Laura Jo Martin Kilgore. His father was an oil-well driller and contractor. He was a descendant of the pioneer John Kilgore, who settled in Chester County, Pa., in 1730.

He attended West Virginia public schools and received his LL. B. from West Virginia University in 1914. He taught public school in Hancock, W. Va., in 1914–15, and in 1915 organized the first high school in Raleigh County, W. Va., serving for a year as its principal. He began the practice of law in Beckley, W. Va., in 1916.

When the United States entered the First World War, he enlisted in the Army, serving from 1917 to 1920, successively as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain. In 1921 he became a member of the West Virginia National Guard, was commander of its 2d Battalion from 1922 to 1932 and was long active in its judge advocate general's department. He retired in 1953 as a colonel.

He continued the practice of law until 1933, when he became judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va. He was reelected to the judgeship in 1938, and served until his election to the United States Senate. As a judge he won a statewide reputation for his concern with the problems of young offenders, and he was one of the organizers of Mountaineer Boy's State.

He was an ardent advocate of doing something about the matter of our juvenile delinquency. He was one of the founders of the Second Boys State organized in the United States at Jackson Mill in West Virginia.

He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1940, defeating Senator Rush Holt in the Democratic primary and the Republican candidate, Thomas Sweeney, in the general election. He was reelected in 1946, in a year when there were widespread Republican gains in other States, again defeating Thomas Sweeney. He was reelected in 1952, defeating former Senator Chapman Revercomb, the Republican candidate, becoming the first person ever elected by the people of West Virginia to three successive terms in the United States Senate.

Senator KILGORE was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly and chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration. He was also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the State and Justice Departments.

During his years in the Senate he also served on the Armed Services Committee, and the former Senate Committees on Privileges and Elections, Mines and Mining, Military Affairs, Claims, and the special Truman Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

Senator KILGORE early won a national reputation as a liberal Democrat. He sponsored and vigorously supported legislation in a number of fields, for better mine safety laws, more adequate social security and unemployment compensation, fair labor legislation, a Federal program to combat adult illiteracy, veterans legislation, small business and antimonopoly legislation and rural electrification; and in foreign affairs he was an initial supporter of the Democratic programs to combat communism, including the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and point 4.

Senator KILGORE assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee when the Democrats took control of the 84th Congress. He was a liberal and had been a strong supporter of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Senator KILGORE is survived by his widow, Mrs. Lois Kilgore, two children, Mrs. Albert T. Young, Jr., of Falls Church, Va., and Robert Martin Kilgore, of Washington; a sister, Mrs. C. Russell Turner, of Cleveland, Ohio; and five grandchildren, Albert, Helen, and Bonnie Young, and Scott and Candace Kilgore; an aunt, Mrs. Alva Echols, of Greenville, Pa., an uncle, Foster Martin, of Clarksburg; and a cousin, Wayne Martin, of Clarksburg, W. Va.

Mr. Speaker, may I in this hour of their bereavement take this opportunity to express to Mrs. Kilgore and to her excellent son and daughter the heartfelt sympathies of myself and, I am sure, the heartfelt sympathies of practically every West Virginian.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn the loss of a friend, and the Stars and Stripes bows its colors in silent gratitude to Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,

whose love of his fellow man and duty to country has made him a leader among leaders.

This is one of the saddest days of my life for death has taken from me a close and loyal friend. I think back to days gone by when the Senator's family and my own were neighbors in the hills of Monongalia County, W. Va.—when our families were mountain-folk neighbors, working and planning together, grieving and merrymaking together. The friendship between my father and the elder Kilgore was so sincere that when I was born my father declared, "Your name shall be Harley."

So life progressed through the years and each of us followed various paths, but always there were contacts which in a large measure influenced my life, spiritually as well as politically. To me, HARLEY KILGORE has been an ideal, a teacher, a protector.

But the Nation has lost so much more than I. It has lost a servant, tried and tested and proven worthy. He has been the staff of Presidents, and the counselor of the workingman, the teacher, the farmer. He has put the welfare of the Nation and the State of West Virginia above self. Even until almost the hour of his death he was studying and planning and solving problems that face this Nation and the world.

What makes a man great? Surely, it is not the kind remarks, expressions of sympathy, or wordy eulogies in his behalf made after his death. No, I feel a man is great who has so built his record during his lifetime—in his boyhood, youth, and manhood—by his good deeds done for his fellow men.

Senator KILGORE was a good man, a kind man, a Christian, a family man, and a statesman. There is no doubt but that he will go down in the annals of history as a great man.

Yes, I have lost a benefactor; the Nation has lost a leader; but our loss is God's will and we must accept His wisdom.

My heart goes out to Mrs. Kilgore, their son, Bob, and daughter, Eleanor. They have lost a good husband and kind father.

The untimely death of Senator KILGORE is a loss almost too much for the human heart to endure, yet there is much solace and comfort in the knowledge that his years on this earth were spent in service for his fellow men, and to the members of his family I say, may the Good Lord console you with his nearness.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep and personal feeling of bereavement that I rise to join my colleagues in mourning the passing of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia. Senator KILGORE, who died last night, was more than a distinguished Senator and an outstanding West Virginian. He was a great American who, through his memorable career in the Senate of the United States, has contributed to the Nation a vast number of public accomplishments which will serve well our generation and those who will follow us.

Senator KILGORE's presence among those who guide the destiny of our country will be sorely missed. The loss will not be felt in West Virginia alone. Common people over all the United States have lost a great friend, for Senator KILGORE, throughout his career in the Senate, dating back to 1941, distinguished himself by never losing his faith in the ordinary citizen. His sole guide in reaching a decision on any public matter was inevitably the interest of that great body of men who have so few powerful voices to speak for them in Washington—the average American citizen.

Senator KILGORE had a keen analytical mind. He was an avid reader with a broad knowledge of history and Government. He could understand and contribute to the solution of complex national problems. Yet he never lost his regard and respect for the private individual. Despite his knowledge and his high office he possessed true humility. Whether on a trip through West Virginia or at his office in Washington he was ever ready to discuss a personal problem, however small, with any of his constituents. His door was always open to anyone; the Senator's advice was available to all who sought counsel with him. He, therefore, leaves behind him a host of people in every walk of life who were privileged to meet him and receive his personal help.

The achievements of Senator KILGORE have been so numerous and so imposing that but to review them is to wonder at the magnitude of the spirit which evoked them. I shall not presume to set them out here today completely. Nor can I presume to relate here the highlights of his career. From a series of great accomplishments, who can profess to designate the greatest. Senator KILGORE retained a lifelong interest in advancing legislation in the field of human rights. He was prominent in the fight for better social security, rural electrification, and unemployment compensation. He maintained a vigorous interest in our foreign affairs. He supported the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the point 4 program.

In the Senate he served with distinction on the Judiciary Committee, of which he was chairman at the time of his death. He contributed much to the soundness of our law through his work on this committee.

During World War II he cooperated with former President Truman on the special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. We all know the accomplishments of this committee headed by then Senator Truman. To these accomplishments Senator KILGORE contributed immeasurably.

Although the man is no longer with us, the very programs with which he was associated will be judged by the historians of the future as beacons of progress in our Nation's development, and the name of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE will live in the continued expansion of the work he leaves behind him.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth West Virginia District [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to a distinguished public servant. Senator KILGORE was my friend, a friend of the kind we find only once in a while on earth. I might say that he was my neighbor, too, because he came from my own Raleigh County. The people of my county and State loved and respected Senator KILGORE. They respected him because he was brilliant; they loved him because he was humble. They mourn his passing, not alone for what they have lost but also for the great man which our Nation has lost.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the privilege of every man to build for himself a great shaft of granite or to engrave his name upon a plate of bronze. It is, however, within the power of every human being to so live as to plant an ever-growing flower of love within the bosoms of all whom he meets. Senator KILGORE planted this flower, and it will never cease to shed its fragrance in the lives of those who knew him.

I know that words can do little to relieve the sorrow which has come to Senator KILGORE's family. Words cannot remove the vacant chair or heal the wounded heart. My sympathy goes out to his companion and to those whom he left behind when he embarked upon the voyage to that bourn from which there is no return. They will miss him. We will miss him. But there is comfort in the knowledge that the painful question asked centuries ago by Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?" was answered by the Man of Galilee:

> I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

This is the hope that leads us on in the day of trials, the hope that enables us to believe that some day, somewhere, we shall see our friend again.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from West Virginia may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, a sad day for me. This is a sad day for West Virginia and for the people of the United States. News came over the radio this morning of the passing of my very dear friend, the Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, a beloved Member of the United States Senate from West Virginia.

Senator KILGORE was truly an outstanding West Virginia son. He was a wise man, an able lawyer, a soldier of respect, a judge of note, a legislator in the truest sense of the word. All West Virginians were gratified to see him serve

as chairman of the respected Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate.

He was a fine husband, a considerate father, an excellent citizen. In fact, earlier this month, Senator KILGORE had been unanimously selected as West Virginia's Son of the Year for 1956. This is an award given to West Virginia's outstanding son.

Today, my memory goes back to my own late husband. During our years together here in Washington we both treasured our friendship and association with Senator and Mrs. Kilgore. Especially after the passing of my own husband did I appreciate the wise counsel and true friendship so generously and graciously extended by HARLEY KILGORE.

A wise and steady voice in the guidance of the affairs of state has been silenced—a great loss to our Nation. However, I cannot help but feel that we are—as a Nation and as individuals—better off because of the life and work of HARLEY KILGORE. He was truly a dedicated public servant who gave freely of his energy and ability. He respected human rights. As a true friend of the workingman, he served all of the people faithfully and well. We are grateful to this great statesman.

To his loyal and wonderful wife, Lois, and to his two children and his grandchildren, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy, and reaffirm our close and binding friendship.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to pay my respects to the memory of, and to express my regret at the passing of, Senator KILGORE.

It was when I was in North Korea in December, 1950, that I received from my wife a newspaper clipping from the Newark News showing Senator KILGORE in Newark, N. J., addressing a State democratic group at a banquet. Part of the mission of the banquet was to elect, I later discovered, myself, to the Congress of the United States. So, in absentia, Senator KILGORE did much for me in helping to bring me to the Congress. How then can one forget such a man? It was natural when I arrived in Washington to look the Senator up; I expressed my thanks to him and with those thanks there was a reciprocity of feeling that prevails even to this very moment; a great warmth existed between Senator KILGORE and myself.

I suppose if in certain religious faiths it is permissible to say, "The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" when we pay our respects to the One, so too, I wonder if we can, in speaking of our fellow man, say that each of us is three people—the person we know ourselves to be, the person that others believe we are, and that person that each of us strives to be in that little window of the mind.

I believe I knew Senator KILGORE as he knew himself. I knew him as I saw him in action, and I think I knew him in that little window of the mind that brings us all here to the Nation's Capitol to legislate what is best for the future of America while shepherding its present. He was a student who liked to evaluate the present and point for the future by revelations of the past. For instance, it was news to me that as early as the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 and 1905, there was a plan by certain Americans to girdle the globe with a railroad from Alaska to London across the Bering Sea through northern Russia to Scandinavia thence south to Calais and under the English Channel to Dover thence to London.

That plan was stymied by certain interests headed by Prince Ito in Japan who sought as a condition a priori from Russia for the peace that ensued at Portsmouth that America not be allowed to go ahead with its railroad around the world. Senator KILGORE said that had we had that railroad and had Pearl Harbor been more destructive than it was to our fleet and had we met more substantial opposition from the submarines of the enemy, and had we been paralyzed on the water, this American dream of the early 1900's of the railroad around the world running as it would have through the lands of our allies, could have and would have saved us. It would be interesting to know what force that tacit Russo-Japanese agreement has today. Senator KILGORE, to me, was always thinking of alternatives, always thinking of what America could do, should do in the face of any sudden danger that could come upon it. Your measure as an individual in the service of your fellow man, it seemed to him, was your ability to come up with an alternative which would spell safety and happiness in the face of disaster or peril.

I think the aforementioned discloses, perhaps, that the Senator was a deep student of history. He liked to weigh his opinions with an evaluation of the past so that you could understand why conditions were as they were today without your taking the meat axe out and hitting over the head the man who might be in opposition to you because his appreciation of a predicament is based on his understanding of facts as seen through his window, not yours.

Situations that one often confronts here in the Congress, according to Senator KILGORE in my discussions with him, come about because of crosscurrents of thought, of movements, opinions, and facts that are available to people when they act as they do. He once said: "Do not ever make a conclusion unless you understand why any man does as he does. Even though you think you are right, allow that man his say, his opinion, with you, not just in court but in conversation and debate."

We traveled together in November of 1951. It was there, on that trip to Europe which carried us as far as Athens where I met his charming wife, Mrs. Kilgore. In Geneva at breakfast one morning we discussed many things confronting the world. Always Senator KILGORE came up with the human equation. The interest of man was the practical interest. Always you could see man against the silhouette of the sun. The shadows that were cast by man he said oftentimes were shadows of sorrow brought about by the ills of other people.

He was never afraid of a combination of men or organized groups against him; rather did he say: "So long as I know that what I am doing can promote the best interests of the individual, and multiply that man by the many millions which go to make up the United States, then do I know that I am serving the best interests of the United States. But for me to simply disregard people and say that I stand for the best interests of the United States without a regard for the one man we should preserve, and that is the citizen and his integrity, would make me false." After all, our great reservoir is in Christendom; in the spirit of the life of Christ to support mortal man; and yet, what is the lesson of Christianity? Lay hands on Christ and you crucify Him as they did in those days of old—one man who was just another person—and they did not give him the time of day. And his defense? Study the trial of Christ and see how unjust it was. That was Senator KILGORE'S philosophy, the philosophy of tolerance and understanding. How different from worldly judgment; if you say you are a Christian, you give a person every consideration; you dare not move one false step in his direction without being guilty in your time of the crucifixion of Christ. We are all God's children. Such a profound man was Senator KILGORE. Many people look at the crucifixion of Christ as an isolated, historical thing that took place 2,000 years ago. It is repeated every day when we move falsely against man. In this Senator's judgment we should be guided by the simple spirit of the Christ toward the millions of our fellow men.

In closing, I wish for Mrs. Kilgore and the family of the Senator every happiness that it is possible for them to muster in this moment of their bereavement, happiness that will live with them from here on out in knowing that there are others in the land who will carry on the inspiration of the Senator they cherish. I shall try as long as I can.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and public service of Senator KILGORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked this morning when I heard the sad news of the passing of Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia. While I was aware of his illness and confinement to the Bethesda Naval Hospital, I gathered from the public press during the past few days that he was much improved and was about to return to his home.

I knew the distinguished Senator quite well and considered him a close and loyal friend. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies. As I

hold similar status in the House, I naturally had occasion to see and talk with him from time to time and of course we served together on the conference committee in connection with the annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies. He was also chairman of the powerful Judiciary Comimttee.

I have always found HARLEY KILGORE intensely loyal and sincere. He had the esteem and respect of all his fellowmen. During his service in the United States Senate he made a great contribution to good government and his passing is a tragic loss to his State and country.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his lovely wife and son and daughter in their bereavement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 411).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profund sorrow of the death of Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator of the United States from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints the following as members of the funeral committee on the part of the House: Messrs. BAILEY, STAGGERS, Mrs. KEE, Messrs. BYRD, MOLLOHAN, BURNSIDE, and SILER.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1579. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1954, and the Fire and Casualty A-*, approved October 9, 1940"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1580. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1581. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff as of December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 201 (c) of Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1582. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 10th annual report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1583. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Springsteel Island, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1584. A letter from the Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year 1955, pursuant to the charter of the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8535. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; with amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 408. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9429, a bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 409. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2128, a bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 410. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9428, a bill to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9257. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 402. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 406. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 7176, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Morton J. Krakow; with amendment (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; with amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Donald W. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7703. A bill for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 66. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 68. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9582. A bill to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9583. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9584. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for certain hearings before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission at locations convenient to claimants; to provide that claimants shall be afforded the right to examine evidence in the possession of the Commission, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses; to provide judicial review of certain actions of the Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9586. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9587. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 9588. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9589. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9590. A bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9591. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 9592. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 9593. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 9594. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 9595. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 9596. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9597. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 9598. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9599. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 9600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for amortization deductions with respect to housing facilities for farmworkers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9601. A bill to provide that certain voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9602. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 9603. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9604. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Sergeant Floyd Monument as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 9605. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post offices at St. Joseph and South St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 9606. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9607. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9608. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 9609. A bill relating to the compensation and term of office of the judge of the District Court of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 9610. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River for flood control and allied purposes in the vicinity of Mankato and North Mankato, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 9611. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 9612. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9613. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9614. A bill to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 9615. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9616. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9617. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 9618. A bill to amend and clarify section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to confirm jurisdiction in the Federal courts to enforce section 9 (g) (3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9619. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 9620. A bill creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9621. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9622. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain sales of antique weapons from tax under section 4181 thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 9623. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9624. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 9625. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 9626. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9627. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9628. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent interference with the police powers of the States and to prevent interference with the power to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1956, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. J. Res. 563. Joint resolution authorizing the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 412. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents recently occurring in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Res. 413. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents recently occurring in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 11, a bill to reaffirm the national public policy and purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

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 Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing grants-in-aid to State agencies for the promotion and enforcement of safety in industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9629. A bill for the relief of Eva Magalhaes y Aguirre alias Eva Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9630. A bill for the relief of Anna Rossetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9631. A bill to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 9632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarabelle Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 9633. A bill for the relief of Paul Clifford Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9634. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9635. A bill for the relief of the Sergeant Bluff Consolidated School District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 9636. A bill for the relief of Chi-Tsu Tsang; his wife, Yung-tsing Hwang Tsang; and their children, Arlene Bai-Hwa Tsang, Betty Lai-Hwa Tsang, Carl Yang-Hwa Tsang, Doris Tiau-Hwa Tsang and Diane Si-Hwa Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9637. A bill for the relief of Kwen Fang Sun, his wife, and his minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 9638. A bill for the relief of Costas George Vernadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 9639. A bill for the relief of Refugio Guerrero-Monje; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9640. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property hertofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 9641. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9642. A bill for the relief of Mariano Santana Llamas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Kujawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 564. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

582. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 107 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

583. Also, petition of 47 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

584. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of citizens of Sayre and Bradford County, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

585. By Mrs. CHURCH: Resolution adopted February 21, 1956, by the unanimous vote of the board of directors of the Union League Club of Chicago, approving the recommendations of the Hoover Commission insofar as they pertain to the achievement of greater efficiency and economy in the Federal Government, and pledging its support in behalf of the study and adoption of said recommendations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

586. By Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Petition of Mrs. Percy C. Whiting, and 477 others from the Detroit, Mich., area urging the enactment of legislation to establish a commission to study the transportation of obscence and immoral literature in interstate commerce and the necessary legislation to prohibit any such transportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

587. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Associated Farmers of Richland County citing their opposition to social security and also petition of the same group setting forth their opposition to controls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

588. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Pearl Jones Gates and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., protesting alcoholic-beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

589. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Pioneer Water Co., Porterville, Calif., urging the immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the immediate commencement of construction of Success Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

590. Also, petition of the chairman, Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing their support of House Joint Resolution 309 (S. J. Res. 94); the objective of which is to restore the protection of our Federal Constitution to the fundamental rights of United States citizens serving abroad as members of our Armed Forces, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, Weather Control Research Association, Bishop, Calif., requesting that the life of the National Advisory Committee on Weather Control be extended as proposed in Senate bill 2913; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Lake Mead National Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who would not agree that the Arizona Highways magazine, published monthly by the Arizona Highway Department is one of the finest publications of its type to be found anywhere.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the State of Arizona on the excellent work contained in the March 1956 issue of Arizona Highways, which is devoted to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, part of which is situated in the State of Nevada. This area comprises 2,655 square miles of federally owned land and joins Grand Canyon National Monument on the east and follows the course of the Colorado River for approximately 185 miles, extending as far south as Bullhead City, Ariz. Within this vast acreage are to be found two sizable and scenic manmade lakes. One of these is Lake Mead, which is formed by the water impounded by Hoover Dam, which is the largest manmade lake in the world, and which with 550 miles of shoreline offers countless panoramas of rugged, beautiful country.

Below Lake Mead and formed by the water impounded by Davis Dam is found Lake Mojave, some 67 miles of rugged canyons and attractive mountain scenery.

To this recreation area last year came nearly 2½ million visitors who were thrilled by the scenic and geologic sights and scientific developments to be seen there. One of the best known visitors last fall came from as far as England. He was Sir David Campbell, and on the placid waters of Lake Mead he set a new world's speed record for hydroplanes.

Mr. Speaker, like all of the 181 areas in the National Park Service, there is much additional work to be done here. Potentially the Lake Mead National Recreation Area is one of the largest playgrounds in the Nation, although up to the present but a small portion of its potential has been tapped.

Even without further development, I am sure that those who have been fortunate enough to visit this area will agree that their efforts were very worthwhile, and the Arizona Highways magazine has done a commendable job in portraying it. It is my hope that the March issue will further kindle interest in the development of our National Park Service, and I am sure that my colleagues from Arizona join me in extending a cordial invitation to all who might be interested in seeing some of the outstanding scenery of the West to visit the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

Secretary Dulles and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans who have become uneasy of late about the unsteadiness of our leadership in the realm of foreign policy, I read with considerable curiosity the speech delivered February 26 in Philadelphia by the Secretary of State. It is stimulating to have Mr. Dulles with us from time to time to speak for the administration, because the dramatic changes in Communist strategy which have been building up in Moscow for the past year require a thoughtful response from our Government. Mr. Dulles' speech seems to qualify as thoughtful, although it is not always his prepared utterances which make the happiest impact on his public. One looks in vain, however, for new ideas to match the new departures of the Communist high command. We can only hope that this does not signify that Mr. Dulles really believes what he suggested to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 2 days earlier—that the Russians were only at that very moment revising their whole program because of cumulative failures. Any newspaper reader realizes that the revision of the Communists' approach to the world has been in effect most drastically for many months.

Yet even though the Secretary of State made no really new proposals in his address, I fear that the response of his party followers in Congress will be something new. Ordinarily an administration spokesman can expect the Members of his own party in Congress to applaud and support his recommendations.

This should be particularly true in matters which truly embrace the national interest, as do our relations with the underdeveloped nations of the world. If a Secretary of State, himself, cannot command such allegiance, surely his President should be able to find friendly voices among his own party in Congress to speak up in favor of his recommendations. Yet the one idea in Mr. Dulles' address which evidences any degree of freshness is one that has been met by silence within his own party—a silence made all the more humiliating by the fact that a band of Democratic Members of the House have publicly announced themselves in favor of the proposal.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the request made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address that he be given authority to commit this country to support a limited number of economic and technical assistance projects for a period of time sufficient to insure their completion. This authority is deemed necessary by the administration to strengthen our policy of positive contributions toward creating a better life among the newly enfranchised peoples of the world whose struggle for democracy is so vitally important to the free nations. Secretary Dulles reiterated this proposal, Sunday. The acceptance of this idea by myself and 16 of my Democratic colleagues was publicly announced on January 22. The President and Mr. Dulles must long for a similar profession of agreement from their own side of the aisle. The idea of advance commitment of aid funds is somewhat new, to be sure, although Congress has certainly indulged in implied commitments in undertaking previous large-scale aid programs even on a yearly appropriations basis. Yet, at a time that cries out for original responses to the changing situation which confronts us, it must be disheartening to the Secretary to find Members outside his own party taking the lead in seconding this modest new suggestion, while his own party colleagues remain eloquently silent.

As a signer of the letter of the 17 House Democrats on January 22, I am happy to renew my support of the Eisenhower-Dulles proposal for limited authority to commit this country to aid important foreign development projects until their completion. It is regrettable, we feel, that Members of the President's own party have not given him and his sometimes harassed Secretary of State a similar expression of approval.

Rabaut Receives Highest DAR Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the honor bestowed by the Daughters of the American Revolution upon my colleague and fellow Michigander, Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT. The Daughters presented Mr. RABAUT with their highest tribute—the award of merit—for his efforts in having the words "under God" inserted in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This ceremony was most fitting, as Mr. RABAUT has worked long and hard to remind the American people that all we are or ever will be is a direct result of divine protection.

I am happy to append the presentation speech of Mrs. T. O. Timberlake, regent of the Continental Dames, District of Columbia DAR, and the acceptance statement of Congressman RABAUT:

ADDRESS BY MRS. T. O. TIMBERLAKE, REGENT, CONTINENTAL DAMES CHAPTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAR

This great Nation was born of an intense and burning desire for freedom—to live, to

work, and to worship God. The ancestors of the Daughters of the American Revolution sacrificed their all for these ideals. They fought with every tangible odds against them, except their burning zeal and their supreme faith in God. Everything they did was done in faith and the knowledge that God was with them. In every deliberation and every meeting or battle—in their homes—they asked God's blessing and His guidance. They suffered hardship and privation, they fought and died in the bitter cold and snow with prayers on their lips and they sat down to write the greatest documents ever written, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, only after invoking God's blessing and guidance. And America grew and prospered.

Somehow, we seem to have forgotten God—we have forgotten that He is still and will always be our only hope and refuge and that it is we who have separated ourselves from Him, and not He from us.

You, Congressman RABAUT, have done a beautiful and a far-reaching service to your country and to the American people by introducing and engineering the passage of a bill in Congress to insert the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag—thereby bringing constantly to our thoughts the fact that this Nation is under God.

The Daughters of the American Revolution strive constantly to preserve the American way of life—to keep ever sacred the ideals of our Founding Fathers, and because what you have done is so definitely consistent with our purposes, Continental Dames Chapter of the District of Columbia, DAR, has empowered me, their regent, to present to you the Daughters of the American Revolution Award of Merit for 1956—the highest honor within our power to bestow.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN LOUIS C. RABAUT

It is a great pleasure to have an endeavor of mine honored by such a distinguished group as the Daughters of the American Revolution. Your organization long ago became synonymous with patriotism, devotion to duty, and moral strength.

I want to thank especially Mrs. Timberlake and the Continental Dames Chapter for the kind invitation to come here today and receive your coveted award of merit.

Perhaps you have wondered what set of circumstances combined to bring about this historic change in the wording of the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I certainly would never infer that I was the first to strive for a recognition of the Almighty in our national affairs. On the contrary, many organizations and individuals have sought to accomplish this worthy end. The Knights of Columbus and the American Legion had unofficially incorporated the meaningful words in their pledge recitation prior to my bill. The first suggestion for appropriate legislation came to me from a private citizen, a Mr. Mahoney of Brooklyn. Also, the Reverend Doctor George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, in a sermon with the President in attendance, spoke on the subject of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and urged that the phrase "under God" be added to the pledge of allegiance. I am happy and proud that I was able to be the instrument of change.

In addition to my Under God bill, I introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide a mail cancellation die bearing the words, "In God We Trust."

When the 3-cent and 8-cent stamps were issued bearing this motto, I did not press for further action on my bill, but later introduced a bill of similar importance, using instead the words "Pray for peace." This bill, H. R. 692, was passed in the House last year and it is now in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I would appreciate you contacting member friends throughout this country and urge them to write their Senators in support of my action. I feel that mail going throughout this country and the world bearing the words, "Pray for peace," cannot help but turn men's minds toward the only One who can really give us the peace so urgently sought in these troubled times.

How proper it is that we, as the first of the sister nations of the earth, proclaim to the whole world, as did our Founding Fathers, our praise and dependence upon Almighty God.

In closing, I would like to thank you again for inviting me here today. You are a most gracious group of ladies. I will always remember this day and cherish this high honor you have bestowed upon me.

Politics and Parity; Sanity and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is now under debate in the other body one of the most unsound, unrealistic, and wholly demagogic bills that has ever been presented to any Congress. I refer specifically to the pending farm bill which undertakes to combine the administration's soil bank plan with a restoration of 90 percent supports.

The proponents of this outlandish combination ignore completely the established fact that farm prices hit the toboggan while high rigid supports were in full force and effect, and it is without all logic and contrary to commonsense to now turn to a device under which the farmer has taken his worst licking as a means of restoring him to economic parity with the rest of industry.

The soil bank plan is designed primarily to eliminate the agricultural surpluses which have acted as a price-depressant, and we certainly meet ourselves coming back when we reinstitute high supports which can only serve to accelerate production and start the extra crops, for which there is no market, again rolling into Government storage bins.

The proponents of this legislative throwback, motivated solely by the concern for the farm vote, are charging the administration—and Secretary Benson—with dragging their heels in attempting to dispose of the enormous pile of food and fiber now in Government hands, whereas the record is quite clear that with 90 percent supports we have priced ourselves completely out of the foreign market. The Secretary is striving with might and main to dispose of this albatrosslike burden from around the Department's neck, but the best he has been able to do is to sell his goods at cutrate prices or for counterpart funds, either of which means a staggering loss to the American taxpayer.

Those who are now bleeding so profusely for the farmer—while all the while they are concerned only with his vote—should come forth honestly and advocate a straight cash subsidy to take care of the differential between farm income and farm costs. I would, of course, vote against such handouts just as I have always opposed high rigid supports, although I must concede that such a plan would be marked by an honesty which is wholly absent from the current legislative monstrosity now pending in the other body.

The following is an editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 25, wherein the finger is put directly on the inconsistencies embodied in this current hybrid—which in common with its kind can only prove to be sterile:

GET POLITICS OUT OF FARM SUPPORT BILL

Just about the most freakish—and most unsound—legislation ever attempted on America's farm problems is the hybrid bill now before Congress.

It is an election-year monstrosity in which Democrats, for perfectly obvious political reasons, are linked with some farm State Republicans to force a return to the high rigid farm price-support system. In this move the high, unalterable, and artificial support plan is jammed on top of the administration's "soil bank" proposal.

That would make the measure, by which the administration aimed to reduce excess acreage and thereby to hold down huge, unmanageable farm crop surpluses, worthless.

Is this politically motivated scheme headed toward greater prosperity for farmers? Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, declared in a speech yesterday, "High rigid price supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer and never will."

But they have brought the dead weight of vast, unusable, unsalable accumulations of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. We think Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson called the turn in his television appearance Thursday night when he declared, "Surpluses are smothering farm prices and income."

They can't be sold to any worthwhile extent; can't even be given away. But they hang like a vast pall over the farmers of the United States: always a threat to existing prices; always a brake on better prices.

Senator AIKEN showed yesterday how the real upsurge of farm prosperity came from the Second World War; then from the Korean conflict. Farm prices, he said, skidded between those two outbreaks; then took another downward turn starting in 1952.

Congress gave President Eisenhower a mandatory directive to continue the high price supports—the 90 percent of parity system—for 2 years, the Senator said. And what happened? It filled the Government and other warehouses to overflowing again. It made farmers—to be paid with tax money—plough and sow acreage far above requirements to produce immense crops that had no place to go except those warehouses.

Mr. Benson has fought valiantly, and continues to fight, for a formula that will cut down unneeded crop acreage, and unusable crops, and in time reduce the need for all this storage of crops nobody wants. Senator AIKEN took a significant jab on the latter point in his speech when he referred to some champions of high-level supports as people "making fortunes out of storage of Government surpluses." Few, if any, of those engaged in crop storage are farmers.

The important thing Senator AIKEN did yesterday, as Mr. Benson has been doing all along, is to shed a clear light on the hard facts about high farm price supports: That

they didn't solve farm problems and won't solve them if tried again.

The administration bill seeks, by reducing acreage—for which farmers would receive a subsidy, and a realistic application of flexible farm price supports—to create barriers against greater and greater surpluses.

But the farm-bloc amendments, for the 90-percent-of-parity supports, would wipe out the soil-bank plan. It's plain enough the soil bank would work to reduce farm crop surpluses; the high-level supports would make certain that more surpluses would occur. That shows how charged with politics the farm bloc's 90-percent-of-parity revival is.

For the farmers, and the Nation, it would be a backward step to continue the same faulty attempt to meet farm problems that have failed in the past. No sound, permanent solutions of those problems can be worked out by politicians for political reasons. The Eisenhower-Benson program seeks real and lasting solutions. Without the crippling partisan amendments that have been loaded on to it, that program should have the full support of farmers and all other citizens of the Nation.

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project Threatens California's Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Congressman ENGLE has alleged that the testimony of California witnesses proves that the Colorado River project will not threaten California's water rights. To reach this position, which is diametrically opposed to the conclusions reached by these witnesses, Congressman ENGLE on the one hand has relied upon quotations taken out of context, while on the other he has ignored those parts of the testimony which point out the serious danger in the upper basin project to the State's water rights.

Not only are Mr. ENGLE'S conclusions at odds with those of the legal and engineering experts upon whom he seeks to rely, but they are directly contrary to the official position of the Legislature of California, the State's attorney general, and the Colorado River Board.

Assembly Joint Resolution 37, enacted by the California State Legislature last May, is as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River

Whereas more than 6 million people of this State depend upon the Colorado River as an important source of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial needs; and

Whereas the metropolitan area of southern California, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and some 60 other cities depend on the Colorado River for water and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas the Colorado River is the sole source of water to irrigate over 1 million acres of land in this State; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of two major power and irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River at an estimated total cost approximating $1,750,000,000; and

Whereas one of these projects as contemplated by S. 500, H. R. 270, and companion bills, known as the Colorado River storage project, includes (1) the construction of 6 large dams creating reservoirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 44 million acre-feet, and (2) the construction of 14 or more irrigation projects known as participating projects; and

Whereas these storage dams are not required to serve the proposed irrigation projects but would store water for power purposes under interpretations of the Colorado River compact now being defended against by California in the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas the major irrigation participating projects are very costly transmountain diversion projects to take large amounts of the highest quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to other river basins; and

Whereas the other project, as contemplated by S. 300 and H. R. 412, and known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, is also a very costly transmountain diversion project to take the best quality water out of the Colorado River basin to the Arkansas River basin, and is the initial phase of a project to divert 900,000 acre-feet of water per annum out of the Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas both of these projects are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are now at issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas these projects, if constructed under those interpretations, would be detrimental to both the quality and quantity of water to which California has rights long established by prior appropriation as well as by contracts with the Federal Government for projects now constructed; and

Whereas both proposed projects are based upon questionable standards of financial feasibility and if constructed would cost the taxpayers of our Nation several billion dollars in the form of a subsidy to the lands which would be irrigated; and

Whereas California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Nation, and would therefore be doubly injured if these projects were authorized both by the impairment of the quality and quantity of water to which existing California projects have established rights, and by the burden of a tremendous taxload: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of legislation authorizing the Colorado storage project and participating projects, and legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project until the Supreme Court decides the case now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The State's attorney general, Hon. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, stated as follows on February 24, 1956:

In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated. I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26.

I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorado River project bill constitutes such a threat.

There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado River project bill at this session of Congress.

The argument advanced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] in rationalization of his own position is not a new one. He first advanced it in March 1955, during the House Interior Committee hearings upon the Colorado River storage project on cross-examination of the California witnesses. It was fully and effectively answered at that time—see House hearings on H. R. 3383, pages 977–992.

The following colloquies are illustrative. At page 982:

Mr. ENGLE. If I correctly interpret that statement, it means that this Congress could authorize, and the Bureau of Reclamation could build, all of these participating projects without the impairing by as much as one bucketful the water to which California is entitled under the Colorado River project.

Mr. ELY. Subject to two qualifications: First, if they were built without the construction of storage works which would intercept our water supply; second, to the degree that they do not involve transmountain diversions which would impair the quality of water.

* * * * *

Mr. ELY. Bear in mind two things, Mr. ENGLE: First, quality of water, which we reserve at all times under article 8 of the Colorado River compact; and, second, in all of my answers to you, you and I are both dealing in complete ignorance of the claims of the United States for the use of Indians and as to whether they would be adjudicated to be ahead of the compact and outside of the compact. If they are, then no answer I give you can have any validity whatever because none of us know how much water the upper basin or lower basin would have coming to them after the satisfaction of those rights.

At page 989:

Mr. ENGLE. All I am asking is, Do I interpret that statement correctly, that the State of California and the Colorado River Board regard Glen Canyon, standing by itself, as a sound project?

Mr. ELY. Not as proposed; no, sir. May I explain?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, if you can explain that; go ahead.

Mr. ELY. In Glen Canyon, as proposed, the financial setup is based upon the assumption there may be withheld from the lower basin and accumulated in storage for power generation at Glen Canyon, water which may not lawfully be held there under the Colorado

River compact. Such water must be released to the lower basin and is not available for power generation at Glen Canyon. That is point 1. Point 2: The 6-mill rate proposed here is not realistic. This project is not sound economically.

At page 991:

Mr. ELY. The storage project would be constructed, operated, and filled on the assumption that the upper basin may retain in storage during the filling period, which is about 20 years, some two to three million acre-feet per year that we say the lower basin is entitled to receive. It withholds that from us. That is the consequence during the filling period. There would be a consequent reduction in the quantity of water available for consumptive use in the lower basin in violation of the power contracts. I am still speaking of the filling period. After the reservoirs are filled, then the consequences depend upon the rate of development of the consumptive use in the upper basin.

The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation contained in House Document 364 are based upon the assumption that the ultimate consumptive use planned by section 2 of the bill will be at the rate of 9,500,000 acre-feet in extreme years and will average 7½ million and be calculated upon depletion instead of consumption at the site of use. That means a permanent deprivation of water from the lower basin of about 2 million acre-feet, taking into account the further consequences of the Mexican Treaty.

So my answer to you is, sir, that the effect of this project is immediate in withholding from the lower basin 2 million acre-feet or more per year to which we are entitled as soon as the gates are closed at Glen Canyon. That situation will prevail during the entire filling period. It will recur thereafter to the extent that the upper basin is developed in accordance with the plans presented in the project before you.

The burden of the reports of the State engineer and of the statements of California witnesses was that the reports on which the upper basin project were planned gave no proper or adequate consideration to the interest of the lower basin States, and that the project was planned on erroneous interpretations of the Colorado River compact, all of which cut California's rights seriously, and that the project should proceed only, first, if there were assurances that these rights were not impaired, and second, if the project could qualify under proper criteria of feasibility and repayment. The project fails in both respects.

In these circumstances it was the absolute responsibility of the representatives of the State and the agencies affected to point out these grave failures to the committee. This was done by Fred Simpson, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California; by board members Evan T. Hewes and Samuel B. Morris; by General Counsel James H. Howard for the Metropolitan Water District who also represented Joseph Jensen, member of the Colorado River Board; by Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles and Gilmore Tillman as counsel for the city; as well as by Raymond Matthew and Northcutt Ely, engineer and counsel for the board respectively, the two persons whom Mr. Engle singles out in his attack.

To bear out the concern and objections voiced by these representatives, there is now at hand an independent engineering report on lower basin water supply entitled "Report on Water Supply for Probable Future Developments in the San Diego County Water Authority, September 1955." One of the engineers who made this report is Raymond A. Hill, who completed a report on Colorado River waters for the State of Colorado in 1953—see Senate Document No. 23, 84th Congress, first session. The San Diego report concludes that the upper Colorado River storage project will have a disastrous effect on the water supply of the densely populated coastal cities of southern California. It states that:

16. When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the metropolitan water district, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

17. In order to obtain its full right in the Colorado of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum, it will be necessary to make other arrangements to replace the deficiency resulting from the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project.

18. Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

See report, page 20.

How, in the face of this report, to say nothing of the testimony made in good faith by California representatives, can the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] support this project, and still say, as he does, "should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to water of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor"?

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I beg to advise the House that today I presented to the Congress a resolution on pending farm legislation that was sent me by the Associated Farmers of Richland County, Inc., of Mansfield, Ohio. It sets forth their opposition to any form of Federal control or subsidies.

I also have presented to the Congress a resolution on social security by the Associated Farmers of Richland County over the signature of its chairman, John G. Woods.

I respectfully ask the membership of this body to analyze carefully these resolutions.

Compulsory Licensing—The Path to Creative Atrophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article regarding compulsory licensing of patents provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, published in the February 27, 1956, issue of Washington Atomic Energy Report:

COMPULSORY LICENSING—THE PATH TO CREATIVE ATROPHY

(By W. Sterling Cole)

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides advanced legislative principles and standards to guide a rapidly expanding industrial, scientific, international, and military program. It contains progressive principles and is a sound law, except for the so-called compulsory licensing provisions.

A compulsory license to a patent is a governmental order which authorizes persons other than the patent holder to use and benefit from his discovery. I consider such a provision in any law unconstitutional, unreasonable, and an invasion of personal and property rights for no good purpose.

Proponents of compulsory licensing of atomic energy patents argued that the Federal Government had spent some $13 billion developing the atomic energy art; and that the corporations who were contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission would capture important patents, conceived while a contractor, to the exclusion of companies with no prior AEC relationship. I sympathized with this concern. However, compulsory licensing is not necessary to prevent this happening. I believe in a different approach, one which looks to the problem itself. I would deny a patent in any case where the invention or idea rightfully belonged to the Government.

The framers of the Constitution provided in article 1, section 8, clause 8 that Congress would have the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." The Constitution does not refer to patents as such but rather to the exclusive right of authors and inventors. I examined the available historical records of the Constitutional Convention and found that the word "patent" was considered by the framers but the words "exclusive right" were chosen instead. I believe this was purposeful—to protect the integrity of the grant—to prevent such things as the compulsory license.

The First Congress created a patent system, using the words "sole and exclusive right" in the first patent statute to describe a patent. With this the concept of exclusiveness was fortified. The patent statutes provided the base upon which industrial America grew. The patent gave a temporary monopoly to one individual or company; yet the system was such that the concepts embodied in the discovery were published for the world to see. The competitor or patentee then set to work to improve upon the invention to insure that once again he could compete in the national market place. This guaranteed a pyramid of development and gave birth to an industrial giant.

Congress, in acting later to curb combinations in restraint of trade, passed the antitrust laws—but these laws left intact the patent monopoly. In recent years there have

been proposals calling for a compulsory licensing system because of alleged monopolistic practices involving patents. Such proposals have failed when faced with the contention that the patent monopoly was a fleeting one—one that passed with the next significant improvement.

The compulsory licensing features of the Atomic Energy Act are the first of their kind. They defy the Constitution because the power of Congress is limited to granting the "exclusive right." This patent with a cloudy title is not exclusive—it is public and open to invasion. Thus, section 153 of the Atomic Energy Act does violence to the patent system and established a dangerous precedent.

The greater reason for having a normal patent system in the atomic energy field exists in the express desire of our Government to quickly bring the benefits of atomic energy development to our people. Compulsory licensing will only lead to the creative atrophy of the Socialist state. Why should one improve upon the patent of his competitor if the Government will give him ready access to the existing invention?

During the debate on the 1954 act, the House at first rejected compulsory licensing and substituted an amendment which I proposed. This is now section 152 of the act. This section provides that any invention or discovery in the nonmilitary atomic field conceived during a relationship with the AEC would be deemed to have been made by the Commission but the Commission can waive this right. The House rejected compulsory licensing, but it was adopted by the Senate, as section 153 of the act. As enacted, the law retained both sections.

In this Congress, I have introduced H. R. 5167 which would abolish compulsory licensing and also modify section 152. The amendment would continue to preclude special patent advantages to contractors—but where section 152 now refers to most any relationship with the AEC, my proposed amendment refers only to those relationships with the Commission which were for the benefit of the Commission. (The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold hearings on the Cole bill in March.) It has been the practice of the AEC of late to enter into various contractual relations which are not specifically for the benefit of the Government or of the Commission. An example of such a contract is the so-called access agreement. In such an agreement the Commission contracts to make available to an industrial corporation certain classified information to assist that company in the development of the peacetime applications of atomic energy. The company agrees in return to protect this information. A later idea or discovery produced by this company would not rightfully belong to the Government. H. R. 5167 would therefore amend section 152 so that it would only relate to those contracts which were expressly for the benefit of the Government or the Commission.

Progress in the United States is based upon incentive. This incentive is not only material but has its roots in the satisfactions of accomplishment. I am striving to preserve this.

A Bill for the Protection of Ex-Korean Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which I hope will correct flagrant abuses by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the administration of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which provides for the payment of compensation to ex-prisoners of war for treatment they received in violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

The law voting these benefits contained a provision defining a prisoner of war as one who did not "voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress" give aid to or collaborate with the enemy. It is also necessary to keep in mind that the law requires each claimant to satisfy the Commission as to the exact number of days he received insufficient food—for which he is entitled to compensation at the rate of $1 per day—or was subject to inhumane treatment—for which he is entitled to an additional $1.50 per day.

It has been the practice of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the case of all Korean prisoners of war against whom no allegations of collaboration have been brought, to presume that the claimants were insufficiently fed and inhumanely treated during the entire period of their captivity. Generally speaking, these claims have been paid promptly and in full.

Unfortunately, a very different situation exists with respect to the processing of claims of prisoners of war against whom derogatory information has been received by the Commission. In these cases, the Department of the Army has furnished the Commission with secret and unsubstantiated allegations relating to the activity, treatment, and attitude of certain POW's during their captivity. Upon receipt of this secret and often hearsay information against a claimant, the presumption that he received substandard food and inhumane treatment has immediately been "suspended" and the claimant has thereupon been requested to establish his eligibility by affirmative proof. In other words, the claim has been disallowed by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and the claimant has then had the burden of proof of establishing either that he was not a collaborator or that he, in fact, actually received substandard food and inhumane treatment during each day of his imprisonment.

Claimants who have requested a hearing after having their claim disallowed on primary examination have been furnished a summary of information which, to my knowledge, has been identical for each claimant. In each case, it reads as follows:

A. Assisted the Communist propaganda by:

1. Writing and circulating peace petitions promoting Communist causes.

2. Writing and publishing articles containing information adverse and inimical to the interest of the United States.

3. Drawing cartoons which promoted communism and reflected adversely on the United States.

4. Participating in the preparation and dissemination of front line surrender leaflets.

5. Attempting to influence prisoners of war to accept communism.

6. Participating in the publication called New Life.

7. Actively participating in a group called Yen-So-Yen (workers) whose apparent mission was to interrogate and indoctrinate newly captured prisoners of war.

8. Serving as chairman of the camp peace committee.

B. Received the following preferential treatment from the hostile forces:

1. Better medical care than the other prisoners of war.

2. Better food and better clothing.

3. Easier jobs.

C. Cultivated the friendship of and were overly friendly with the hostile forces.

D. Frequently visited the Chinese officials of the prisoner of war camp by invitation and voluntarily both by day and night.

E. Were selected and approved by the hostile forces for special jobs such as squad leader and chairman of the peace appeal committees.

These are the general charges, Mr. Speaker, which each ex-Korean prisoner of war must rebut if secret and unsubstantiated allegations against him have been received by the Commission.

Actually, however, a claimant has no way of knowing whether he must affirmatively prove that he was badly treated or whether he must prove that he was not a collaborator with the enemy—or whether he must prove both. In dealing with the issue of collaboration, the policy of the Commission is to be found in a memorandum from the general counsel to the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:

It is suggested that in the disallowance of claims under section 6 (e) of the act in which collaboration is an issue, the decision be based upon the finding that the evidence is insufficient to warrant the conclusion that the claimant, while imprisoned, was not fed or treated as provided in the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. No reference, expressed or implied, need be made therein to any official document or report which the Commission may have considered.

What the counsel's memorandum says is that the Commission may come to its conclusion on the basis of the issue of collaboration, and then write up its decision, in the same case, on the basis of another entirely different issue. This amazing document also contains the tacit admission that unevaluated, derogatory information, used by the Commission in reaching its decision, is then hidden from the claimant under the pretext that the information never entered the decision. In short, these hapless veterans find themselves deprived of their benefits and given a false reason, to boot.

I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, how closely this appalling procedure resembles the well known shell game. And I am sure you also see how far afield this procedure is from the accepted traditions of American justice.

The legislation which I have introduced today seeks to correct this deliberate and systematic injustice by requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to specifically inform a claimant of the reasons for disapproving his claim either in part or in full. It gives the claimant or his attorney the right to examine the evidence which is the basis of the Commission's determinations, and it prohibits the Commission from considering evidence which cannot be examined by the claimant.

Because many veterans have not been in a financial position to come to Washington to appear before the Commission,

the resolution introduced today provides that hearings shall be held at a location not further from the claimant's residence than the capital city of the State in which he resides. The measure also gives each claimant the specific right to be represented by counsel, to have compulsory process to require witnesses to appear, and to cross-examine all witnesses on whose evidence the Commission has relied in denying his claim or in disapproving it in part. Evidence given by any witness on whose evidence the Commission has so relied, and who is not available for cross-examination by the claimant, must be disregarded by the Commission in reaching its decision.

In order that past abuses may be corrected, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have been discussing allows claimants to reapply to the Commisison for redetermination of their claims if, in the past, the claims were denied or approved for less than the full allowable amount, on the direct or indirect ground that the claimant collaborated with any hostile force or enemy of the United States.

Finally, the measure establishes the right of claimants, against whom adverse decisions have been handed down by the Commission, to institute proceedings for the review of such decision by filing a written petition in our Federal district courts.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the careful and immediate attention of each Member of this House to the legislation which I have introduced today. The time has come to cut through the maze of fraud and hypocrisy which surrounds the proceedings of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In a letter to me dated January 10, 1956, Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Commission, piously declared that "in the administration of this type of legislation there is no adversary aspect. No one prefers charges or makes accusations. The legislation is of a beneficial nature and the determinations of the Commission are based solely on whether or not a claimant factually meets the eligibility requirements." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a claimant upon whom has been placed the burden of proof to establish that he did not collaborate with an enemy of the United States finds the proceedings to be adversary in every aspect. And I find it more than difficult to understand how Mr. Gillilland can say that "no one prefers charges or makes accusations" when he himself has signed hundreds upon hundreds of letters containing the summary of information against claimants relating directly to the issue of collaboration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beyond the circle of whose all-embracing love we cannot drift, turning from traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction, we pause now for the upward look which makes us one in solemn yet glad communion with Thee, Thou God and Father of all mankind. The heartless cruelty that sweeps the earth often appalls us; but in this hallowed moment we are strengthened by the assurance that when willful man has done his worst he must still reckon with Thee.

Another empty chair in this body reminds each of us that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. We thank Thee for the service that one whose face we will see here no more rendered with ability and devotion, and for the legion of friends his genial nature bound to him in a loyalty strong as steel. Grant the consolations of Thy grace to the dear ones who mourn his passing.

And now, as today we salute the President of a Nation whose long struggles for freedom boast the names of great emancipators and whose history goes back to the grandeur that was Rome, we pray that Italy, escaping the wiles of those who play on her human problems tempting her to barter her liberty and her very soul for specious promises, may recognize her true friends and tie her future to liberty, rather than tyranny, and to truth, and not falsehood, thus espousing the things that belong to her peace. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 29, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following an adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 221, agreed to yesterday, the Chair announces as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, the following:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

EXPENSES OF FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Harley M. Kilgore,