

PORTLAND, OREG., May 17, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope you will give your support to S. 3731, introduced by Senator CARLSON. This bill provides increased annuities to retired Federal employees in line with increases granted active employees, and payable from the civil service retirement fund.

Very sincerely,

M. L. MERRITT.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 18, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am the widow of Ben A. Campbell, retired superintendent of mails of the Portland post office, who passed away in 1946 after serving 46 years in the United States mail service.

I have never received any annuity. I hope this bill, S. 3731, will include the widows whose husbands passed away prior to 1948.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. BEN A. CAMPBELL,  
Member of Chapter No. 29, National  
Association of Retired Civil Em-  
ployees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 9, 1956, I addressed a letter to each member of the committee. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear, so that the retired employees will know the position I have taken on this question. I read the letter which I sent to each member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that on April 11 the Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which you are member, will vote on S. 2875 and on the amendments to it that have been offered.

I want to express to you my hope that the proposals to extend increases in retirement benefits to those presently retired will be approved. I am aware of the fact that retirees received an increase in their annuities last year; however, Congress did not include survivors' benefits in the increase, and the average annuity still amounts only to \$1,600 a year, with no minimum. Half of all annuitants receive less than \$100 a month, and half the survivors receive less than \$50 a month. Surely you will agree that a decent living is just about impossible today on such meager amounts. I believe you will also agree that men and women who have spent their lives in the service of the United States Government deserve better treatment than that.

The National Association of Retired Civil Employees has proposed a series of amendments to extend moderate increases to all on the retired roll. I ask that they be given favorable consideration, and that improved benefits for retirees and survivors be added to S. 2875. The retirement fund appears well able to accommodate them, and while I appreciate that S. 2875 is aimed at improving benefits for those still employed by the Government, it is my hope that retirees and survivors will also be aided in their struggle to meet the cost of living.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I also wish to read into the RECORD at this time a letter I wrote to a group of constituents under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for writing to me about S. 2875 and the amendments that have been proposed to include those

already retired in the increases in retirement benefits. I am informed that the retirement subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will meet soon to vote on the provisions of S. 2875 and that the full committee will take it up immediately thereafter.

Because the retired employees received an increase in their annuities only recently, the extension of S. 2875 to them faces tough going. However, I feel personally that their retirement benefits do not enable them to maintain a decent living standard and that they are entitled to further increases. The average annuity for retirees amounts only to \$1,600 a year and there is no provision for a minimum annuity. Congress did not make provision for survivors in last year's increase and I believe that retirees and survivors should be included in S. 2875.

I am going to discuss this matter with subcommittee members, and urge that they amend S. 2875 to provide additional increases for civil-service employees presently retired. These fine people who have worked for Uncle Sam are not receiving the retirement benefits they deserve, and I shall work for the most favorable treatment possible for them.

The bill requiring that salary increases for civil-service employees include increases in retirement benefits is before the House of Representatives. I believe we should include a statement of this principle in S. 2875, though it cannot be more than a declaration of intent, since this Congress cannot bind future Congresses to specific legislative provisions.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that as of now I believe our best chance of getting needed economic benefits for the retired employees is by way of separate legislation.

If the information I received today proves to be the case tomorrow, there seems to be little chance of getting it done by way of an amendment to S. 2875, because the members of the committee with whom I have talked on the subject have said, "This is a bill that we intend to limit to so-called active civil-service employees, those presently in the employ of the Government, and who are presently paying a certain percentage of their salaries into the retirement fund."

The members of the committee with whom I have talked have also said that they agree with me that additional legislation is needed to meet the needs of the retired employees. I have the feeling that it will have to be by way of an equitable compromise or adjustment between S. 3725 and S. 3731.

To that end I shall devote my attention in the debate tomorrow and in the days to come to the further consideration of those two pieces of separate legislation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

## RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 22 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William H. Andrew, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bryan, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Heavenly Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, we thank Thee for Thy love, Thy goodness to this Nation, and Thy blessings in giving each of us life for this one day. Grant that today may be blessed with the full realization of Thy presence, Thou living God.

May each citizen, in lowly estate and high office, be guided by Thy wisdom. May the decisions made today be according to Thy will. May the people of this Nation have courage to live as well as to die for that which is just and righteous today.

We pray for our President and for the humblest citizen. May Thy love reign worldwide. In our Lord's name. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On May 18, 1956:  
H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;  
H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;  
H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;  
H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;  
H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;  
H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Dazé;  
H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Nell McLeod Smith;  
H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;  
H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;  
H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;  
H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;  
H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;  
H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrick;  
H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;  
H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;  
H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures hereto-

fore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 7513. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn.

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

On May 19, 1956:

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.; and

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1956:

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Colonel Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9257. An act 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; and

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis;

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice;

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia;

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh;

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller;

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel;

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson;

S. 2722. A act for the relief of Fai Hoo;

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez;

S. 2937. An act to increase from \$50 to \$75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service;

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 563), and for other purposes;

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin;

S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuels;

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong;

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal Reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years;

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque;

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas;

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 10875, the farm bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### RED HAT DAY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.



Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago I addressed remarks to the House calling attention to the launching of a unique experiment in the State of Oregon known as Red Hat Day. At that time I described the objectives which this educational program hoped to achieve and suggested that the idea merited adoption by other States of the Union.

The suggestion for Red Hat Day originated with the Portland chapter of the division of Oregon, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., and was officially adopted by the State of Oregon with sponsorship throughout the State by groups interested in conservation, recreation, and by numerous sportsmen's organizations. The general purposes were to promote better sportsmanship practices; prevent fires in timber and range area; encourage caution and safety in hunting; bring about better relationships between sportsmen and landowners; and to encourage observance of game laws.

The results of this experiment have just been made available in a report by the Governor's Red Hat Day committee. The value of the program is abundantly evident from the results which were achieved throughout the State. Enforcement officers of the game division of the Oregon State Police found fewer complaints regarding the conduct of hunters and there were fewer trespass complaints. In some instances, the no-trespassing notices in the local press were substantially reduced. The number of domestic animals killed during the hunting season was the smallest for any similar period on record within the State.

Violations of the game laws were fewer during the early days of the deer hunting season than for any similar period in recent years, although the number of hunters during the year increased by 6 percent.

The United States Forest Service reported about half the average number of fires known or assumed to have been started by hunters. The acres burned as a result of these fires was about one-ninth the previous annual average acreage.

Although more hunting accidents were reported in 1955 than for the previous year, the report indicates that hunters were more careful with firearms when actually hunting. Such accidents arising from individuals being mistaken for game were one-third to one-fourth of such percentages in recent years.

While much improvement can still be made over 1955, the desirability and benefits of the Red Hat Day program has been demonstrated. The public was made generally more aware of the seriousness of the problems facing hunters, landowners, and Government agencies. Succeeding years will bring further improvement as this program continues. Other States may well study the experience of Oregon for improving the protection of life and property and bringing about a higher regard for conservation activities and for the recreational facilities in those States.

#### INDIANA TOMATO AND VEGETABLE JUICE

Mr. BEAMER. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Indiana Cannery Association and with the compliments of the Naas Foods, Inc., of Portland, Ind., I have the privilege of presenting cans of Indiana tomato juice and vegetable juice to all Members of the House of Representatives.

Indiana is justifiably proud of its canned foods and especially of its tomato products which are being shipped to all parts of the United States and to many foreign countries.

It was in Indiana where the first tomato juice was prepared and canned commercially approximately 30 years ago. It was in Indiana, likewise, where the process was developed for separating the color of tomatoes for juice purposes. Later it also was in Indiana where the homogenizing process was developed for the manufacture and canning of tomato juice.

The natural tang and taste of Indiana tomato juice is derived from the natural balance of chemicals in the Hoosier soil, and it is this genuine flavor that affords such a satisfying and healthful drink.

Indiana is one of the largest producers of tomatoes and tomato products in the United States. The Fifth Congressional District that I have the privilege to represent happens to have a great concentration of these tomato farms and canning factories producing tomato products. This industry provides employment and an economic livelihood for thousands of factory workers and farmers. Modern agricultural methods provide constantly improved tomatoes, and the sanitary and approved processing and canning plants combine in the continuous efforts to provide the public with these delectable Indiana tomato products.

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

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to congratulate my colleague upon this very fine endeavor and the effort to inform our colleagues of the House of the very fine products of our State of Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman. I know tomatoes come from his district. All of you will enjoy the tomatoes that come from Indiana.

#### T. COLEMAN ANDREWS

Mr. VANIK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call the atten-

tion of the Members of the House to a recent attack on the income tax in the U. S. News & World Report by T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. Andrews, now employed by The American Fidelity & Casualty Insurance Co., against which company the Government has a \$5 million income-tax claim pending, attacks in particular the effect of the income tax on high-income groups. This kind of an attack is valid and proper by any citizen but the persistent nature of this attack by a former Commissioner of the Service is certainly indiscreet and revolting.

The grave error in Executive decision was the administration's design in appointing a person to administer the tax laws of the land who did not believe in the law. This seems to be a basic policy of this administration. For the top job in the Housing and Finance Agency the administration selected the most ardent foe of public housing. It appears now that the Executive judgment in appointing T. Coleman Andrews as Commissioner of Internal Revenue was about as sound as would be the appointment of Khrushchev as Secretary of the United States Department of Defense.

T. Coleman Andrews has used his title as former Commissioner of Internal Revenue to undermine public respect for our income-tax laws. His persistent attacks raise grave doubt as to the quality of his administration of the laws which he so vehemently attacks now. T. Coleman Andrews should be called before congressional committees and give the benefit of his judgment and opinion so that they can be placed on the record. Then every phase of his work should be carefully reviewed to see how extensively his opposition to income taxes for the high-income groups was manifested through his administration acts.

#### THE FARM BILL

Mr. POAGE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to apprise the Members of the House of the fact that the conferees on the farm bill have just come to a unanimous agreement and we hope to have the bill before the House tomorrow. We also hope that there is not going to be any fight on it. The bill is not what anybody wants. Therefore it must be a pretty good bill.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. 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. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the

Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not more than 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had understood that there was to be 1 hour on each side. That was the understanding which I had.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the insistence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], Mr. Speaker, I amend my request. I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to not more than 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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. 11319, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House today the 12th appropriation bill of the session. It is a rather notable bill in that it establishes something like five exceptional records.

In the first place, it is presented considerably earlier than this bill was presented in the last Congress.

As a matter of fact, all appropriation bills have now been submitted with the exception of the legislative bill, which has already been "marked up," the mutual assistance appropriation bill, on which we are awaiting the action of the legislative committee, and the final deficiency appropriation bill. All of the annual supply bills are far in advance of the general appropriation bills in any Congress since the Congress of 1950, when we submitted them in a one-package bill and when we were far in advance of previous records. And what was more important, saved more money than had ever been saved relatively before or since.

Another feature of our appropriation bills this year is that all of them, with the exception of one bill, are below the budget estimates. In past years we have always taken pride, and the efficiency of a subcommittee chairman was always judged by the amount he cut the estimates.

However, that appears to be no particular cause for self congratulation this time for we also find that all but 2 of these 12 bills are above the appropriation for the current year. Of course, that is the real criterion of economy. Not a comparison with the budget estimates but a comparison with same for the current fiscal year.

And as further cause for regret—and directly connected with our failure to cut below current expenditures—I am sorry to have to report that in these bills we break another record in that we have made fewer cuts and saved less money—a smaller percentage—in these 12 appropriation bills, than has ever been saved on similar bills in recent years—as a matter of fact—since I can remember. It is a real record but one of which we can hardly be proud. The total amount we have actually saved on the bills that have been submitted to the House and an estimate on the remaining three bills aggregates less than half a billion dollars. Out of a budget of more than \$50 billions we have saved only half a billion dollars, the lowest retrenchment for many years.

We have in fact been able to reduce the budget only a little more than 1 percent of all of the more than \$50 billions which have passed through our hands, and that is all the more impressive in view of the fact that the budget this year is the loosest budget, it is the largest peacetime budget ever submitted to Congress by any administration in the history of the United States.

I noticed in one of the leading editorials in this morning's Washington Post a very interesting comment on this situation in which they make this statement:

The Federal budget will be in balance when the fiscal year ends June 30.

It is in balance for the first time in the last 5 years and for the fourth time since the Hoover depression.

The editorial then goes on to say:

This is a notable achievement for which the administration deserves much credit. It has taken a herculean effort to bring the budget into balance.

I regret I have to dissent from both those statements, because this budget has not been brought into balance by any act of economy on the part of the administration at all. This administration has been spending, and is now spending more money than ever spent by any administration in time of peace.

And the editorial contradicts itself in the next paragraph when it says:

Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

That is true, and Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

It further says:

In January expenditures were estimated in advance at \$64.3 billion; now the estimate is \$65.9 billion.

They have not only spent more money than has ever been spent before, but they are spending it at a progressive ratio. They are spending more than they expected to spend last January.

This expenditure has been in the face of the fact that we have had the largest revenues in our history. The revenues this year have been in excess of the revenues of any previous year in the peacetime history of the United States or in the history of any other country in the annals of time. That is what has balanced the budget. It is not economy. It is not a decrease in expenditures. It

is through no effort on the part of the administration. It is solely due to the unexpected increase in revenues.

That increase in revenues is due to the increase in population and to the great prosperity of business and I am willing to make any concession on that count to the administration. But the glamor of that prosperity is dimmed by the destitution of the American farmer, the hardest workers and most indispensable class in America today.

If the farmer had his old time purchasing power, if he had the money he has honestly earned but not received, they would be recruiting more labor in Detroit instead of slowing production and discharging workmen. Every farmer in America needs a new car—and needs new buildings on his farm. The slowdown which has overtaken the automobile industry and the housing industry and is already spreading to national industry generally is due to this administration. No nation can live and prosper half bloated and half busted.

The high revenues which have balanced the budget are temporary. These money trees cannot bloom indefinitely, the few at the top enriched at the expense of the farmer at the bottom. And the policy of the administration in increasing expenditure when they should be retrenching and in increasing its budget simply because more money is coming in is heading toward a day of reckoning.

The administration has not contributed a dollar's worth of economy or retrenchment to the balancing of the budget. The truth is that whereas the surplus by which the budget will be balanced the 30th of June next is \$1,800 million it should have been balanced by billions of dollars that are being sunk without a trace.

And the Congress has been of no help whatever in that respect. Congress is not cutting the budget estimates. Congress is not economizing on its own account. And this bill is an example.

As we witness the stampede across the adjoining corridor to the Committee on Appropriations and listen to the demands recorded in these voluminous hearings for millions of dollars for States and districts, we like to remember that day in 1792 when Washington rode horseback from Mount Vernon to this Hill to select the location of the Capitol Building. It was perhaps a junketing trip but he paid his own expenses. And when the blueprints were being drawn Thomas Jefferson came to this Hill and said to the architect "I want to give something to the United States. I want to give something for this Capitol Building. And the Architect said Mr. Jefferson here in the foyer at the front entrance are six stone columns. You can give those if you wish. And Jefferson out of his slender purse gave the six columns which you see today as you enter through that foyer. Washington refused to accept pay as President. Franklin refused to accept money due him. Many patriots of that day contributed whenever possible and as much as possible to this wonderful new Government—this Government of free men. Even in our



day Herbert Hoover refused to accept pay as President.

They wanted to give something to the United States.

Today everybody seems to be trying to get all they can out of the United States. And they beleaguer the Committee on Appropriations like packs of wolves.

Here we have a bill giving something to everybody. And I voted for it. A year ago we thought we had a very reasonable bill. I collaborated with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the committee reported out a bill we thought was liberal.

But the boys held a little caucus over in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building. Both sides of the aisle got together and they agreed "You scratch my back and I'll scratch your back," and they came over here and ran over us like a bunch of wild steers. You know, 2 or 3 experiences are enough. So I am going to "jine 'em." I am going to vote with them today. Let us make this bill so bad that the people will finally take note.

But I seriously doubt whether that can ever be accomplished now that the tiger has his taste of blood. What we really need is a complete revamping of the budgetary laws of the Nation which will protect Congressmen from themselves. It can be done but I doubt whether the professional spenders will ever permit it to be done.

It is more serious than we realize and it is becoming more serious every year. When men organize and gang up on the committee and the Treasury they confess the poverty of their cause. If their project had any merit it would not be necessary to trade and traffic.

We do not inveigh against any man in this House, or any man to be in this House in the future, for coming before the Committee on Appropriations and requesting an appropriation for a project in his district. That is what he is here for. He is merely performing his duty to his constituents who send him here. But I do say the rest of us ought to consider every application made by everybody from every district and say, "Now, my boy, you are on the right track, but let us be a little reasonable. We are going to have to cut you down a little bit to serve the whole country and put what little taxes are paid in where it will best benefit the most people."

Now, in this connection, may I refer to another article in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. This article is about and by the Vice President of the United States, Vice President Nixon, for whose philosophy all of us on this side have the highest regard. Here is what Vice President Nixon said; and I want to commend it to the Members of this House and the Members of the other House and to the people of the United States as words of the soundest wisdom in this time of great national peril. The Communists have more planes than we have. They have better planes than we have. They are making them faster than we are. If anybody has any doubt about what would happen to this country if one of those hydrogen bombs exploded in the Pacific a couple of days ago should strike this

city, he is certainly a man with little perspective or imagination. One bomb would wipe out this Government right now, and destroy the District of Columbia and parts of Maryland and Virginia with it.

Here is what the Vice President said:

The Communists have said over and over again that they may not have to defeat the United States and the western nations in war; that they may be able to force us to destroy ourselves from within in our efforts to defend ourselves from without, that they may force us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

But I want you to remember, Mr. Chairman, that when that time comes, when Russian planes are bombing every major city in the United States what comfort it will be to remember that in our home districts great expenditures of money have gilded forgotten rivers and thereby made Congressmen famous for life.

In this bill, we have something for everybody; we have something for every section in the United States, and the appropriations that are made in this bill are but the beginnings, the entering wedges, which will cause this bill to cost us increasingly more every year until the bulk of the projects are completed. Bills like this are increasing inflation.

Here is a tabulation showing that the dollar in 1939 was worth 101 pennies; it would buy one dollar and one cent's worth of commodities. I do not have to tell you that it will buy today a little bit less than 52 cents worth. So while we are watching this great prosperity, these big dividends, these high wages remember that you must cut them all in two; the country is just half as prosperous as it looks, and the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is getting half the wages he is supposed to get and you have only half of what you had a few years ago. That has been brought about through this kind of spending.

Oh, there is many a gentleman here who has life insurance in multiples of \$10,000. You think you have \$10,000 worth of insurance; when you check out your family will be taken care of. But do you know that you have lost money on that insurance policy you bought back in 1939 or at a later date. It is worth only half as much as you paid for it, and when you check out and your administrator settles your estate your widow and children get half as much as you thought they would get. That is due to the character of bill we are passing here today.

But let us turn to another section of the bill and take up the provision for TVA. TVA is the greatest engineering project ever successfully projected by any people in the annals of the human race. In its effect upon the American people and upon our wealth and prosperity and upon the world, the Tennessee Valley Authority is the greatest achievement of modern civilization. Practically every visitor from abroad before he returns to his own country wants to visit the TVA development. If it had not been for TVA you would not have the atomic bomb. If it had not been for TVA we would not have been able to extract the aluminum necessary for the wings of our

planes. When in the last world war we squared off to take Tokyo, when the Japs at last were fighting with their backs to the wall on their own hearthstone, when the expenditure of thousands of boys and billions of dollars seemed inevitable, one bomb from TVA delivered by one plane, the wings of which were made from aluminum made possible by TVA, ended the war with complete victory for America.

There are hundreds of thousands of young men walking the streets of our cities today who would not be here had it not been for TVA.

And yet there is a sinister group in this country today who want to destroy TVA, who want to destroy REA, who want to destroy municipal ownership. Why? Solely because they want to put more money in their already bulging pockets and thereby deprive the people of the country of a reasonable price for power. That includes the farm women, the farm mothers, in areas that would not have this advantage but for the public power policy which this group is trying to destroy.

TVA does not take a single customer away from private industry, it does not duplicate any service rendered by private industry, it does not cut the income or the profits of private industry because due to TVA all of them are making more money today than they ever made before and the records will show that.

Mr. Chairman, let us take, for example, page 2 of the report, referring specifically to the last paragraph on that page. Here, Mr. Chairman, the committee recites the immediate situation just as it is. I want to say emphatically at this time, and with the concurrence, I am certain, of the majority of the committee, that this is in no way intended and shall not be construed to limit in any way the authority and the responsibility of the TVA to meet the needs of the TVA service area nor to require any payment in excess of that required by law.

Here is the interesting thing about TVA. It is a source of profit to the Government. The Government has not lost a penny on it, the Government has not given it anything. Every cent is being paid back with interest. It is to be amortized by 40 annual payments. It has made every one of these payments up to this time and is in advance of the requirements. The Government does not lose a penny on it.

The budget estimate came to us with a decrease in appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority of \$21,696,000 below what we spent there for the current year, but they returned to the Federal Treasury this year \$186,500,000.

The same can be said about the Department of the Interior and the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations. They also are being amortized by annual payments with interest. They also are cut down by this budget. Southeastern is cut \$1,978,000. But the revenues from its sales are in excess of \$15 million. It is a profitable investment for the United States, and nobody loses a cent. They pay their own way.

The same thing is true of the Southwestern Power Administration. The budget cut their appropriation \$1 million. They received only 80 percent of what they had in this bill last year, although it was a paying concern and their revenues are estimated at \$12,575,000 for the fiscal year 1957.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I again find myself in a role which I very much dislike. I do not enjoy the responsibility of being a critic with respect to this bill which I have felt to be my responsibility in the course of the past 2 years. But, I do believe that it is a role that must be fulfilled and a role that the public interest requires.

Mr. Chairman, I am not happy with the bill which is before us. I can share in the criticisms that were voiced of it by the chairman of the full committee who just preceded me. But, I can say very sincerely that I do not believe that this is a decent or honorable appropriation bill and I say that meaning no disrespect whatsoever to the members of the subcommittee, for certainly there are members of that group for whom I have the greatest respect, and in whom I have the greatest confidence. But, I do think that anyone who will attempt in an objective manner to examine this bill will find that it is a hodgepodge as it stands today. It was not a good, well-rounded proposal when it came to the committee in the first place, and it has grown worse in its stages as it has progressed through the committee and come here to the floor of the House.

I think that we can start right at the beginning or the intiation of this proposal and say that in my opinion the Bureau of the Budget submitted a much too expansive program in view of all the circumstances that confront the country today.

Over the years, this bill has had its ups and downs. We have not had a regular, stable program of appropriations for this public-works program. There have been some pretty good reasons for that. During World War II the program was brought almost to a halt. We came from that and just resumed the program again, and then came the Korean war and again the program was greatly cut back. But now the time has come when many people feel that we are in a position to go forward with a rather expansive program. But, as I see it, the submitted program was too expansive in view of the other competing programs of the Federal Government at this time. These programs are looking for the same dollars, the same manpower, and the same materials that are necessary in this public-works program. Right now the subcommittee on defense appropriations, for instance, is considering a military construction program in excess of \$2 billion in the fiscal year that covers the same period as this bill does.

This House has passed and the Senate is now reaching the final stages of action on a long-term expanded highway program. Both of those bills, the military construction bill and the highway

program, have been given a position of priority by both the executive and legislative branches of this Government, overall, that is probably higher than that of the program we now have before us.

The Corps of Engineers came before us in the course of the hearings, and aside from these two programs, the highway program and the military construction program, complained, I think with justification, about their inability properly to handle the appropriation which Congress made for the public-works program last year. They are short of engineers; they are short of general overall supervisory personnel to do the job that was foisted upon them by the Congress in the appropriation bill last year, in the manner which the chairman of the full committee has described.

So we are here today to provide the money, but I do not think we are providing the means, for properly executing, carrying out, the program for which funds are included in this bill.

When the bill came to the consideration of the subcommittee of 15 that handled the hearings, there were a number of additions made. There was no formula by which the additions were made. We sat down early in the consideration of the bill and worked out a few basic ground rules, but I must say in all candor that those rules were honored much more in their breach than they were in their observance in the course of the markup of the bill. But not all the blame rests on the members of the subcommittee in that respect, either. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAU] who has worked so often with this bill in the past—for 6 years at least I have had the pleasure of working with him on it—I think it is fair to say just threw up his hands when we found time and time again, where we had written evidence that individual Members of Congress had been told by representatives of the Corps of Engineers that really for economical construction they ought to have more money than had been approved for them by the Bureau of the Budget. That put the subcommittee on the defensive and in a most embarrassing position from the start in attempting to act in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

That was not confined to the Corps of Engineers. There is at least one instance, when we were trying to pay some adherence to what the Bureau of the Budget, the President's financial right arm, had recommended, where testimony was read into the record that somebody from the White House told a Member of Congress, "Well, this has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but if you see fit to put it in, we won't object to it."

So the responsibility for what has happened here will have to fall probably more in terms of lack of leadership on some people in the executive department, at least as much as it would on the committee which had the job of handling this bill. If we had had the kind of backing from the executive department that we should have had, things might have been different. This is a difficult

enough job with all the help we can get from the executive department. But as I said, we really did not have that backing that we should have had this year. I suppose that strong leadership in the committee could have overcome some of those difficulties. But here we were in a position where we had unsatisfactory testimony in many cases but a desire on the part of many members of the subcommittee to put in projects which had not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. So we have that kind of a bill here today. The bill may not exceed the dollar amount of the budget this year but actually the reductions that have been made, at least in the Corps of Engineers part, do not represent any cut in the overall program. Mostly they represent the picking up of unobligated or unused funds in the past.

In contrast to that, we do have great commitments of money in the years that are ahead. For instance, you will find some additions in construction money in projects that total this year between \$5 and \$6 million, but they represent something over \$300 million in terms of commitments of dollars in the year ahead. There is about \$800,000 for increases in planning, and that represents commitments of well over \$150 million in the years ahead.

There was one transfer of \$180,000 from planning in order to get complete evaluation of a project so the committee could know what it was doing in the future. That has been transferred to construction. That is \$49 million to which we are committed without the proper backup information.

In the full committee there was an addition of construction money for 2 projects, totaling less than \$200 million in those 2, but they represent the beginning of navigation on a large waterway the estimated cost of which at this date is well over \$1.2 billion. So we have continued to develop a program which represents huge commitments in terms of next year's appropriations and the years after that. That is without the funds for investigation and survey which have been added, which are the first step in getting us committed to millions of dollars in the years ahead. We have no way of knowing what the total amount of commitments will be for those additional funds for investigation and survey.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made two excellent points here, insofar as I see, in what he has had to say. From what was said in the first portion of his remarks it appeared to me that he was emphasizing that there are many other public projects being undertaken by various agencies of the Government which compete for the money and the manpower and all the rest that goes with it. I refer to page 1 and the top of page 2 of the report:

These funds are allocated to 300 projects with a total estimated Federal cost of approximately \$12 billion.

I take it that is the projected-ahead figure of all of these figures that are



under consideration in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that that would be those for which there are funds for planning or construction, because there is no way of estimating the commitments involved or the total estimated Federal cost of projects which are included just for investigation and survey.

Mr. SPRINGER. My question is this: With the highway program, with this \$2 billion which he has said is being undertaken by the armed services and some other agencies, is it the feeling of the gentleman that many of these projects could be undertaken more economically at other times?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is my feeling—that we are impinging upon programs which have greater urgency and greater priority in the national interest than many of these which are included in this appropriation.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question refers to page 8 of the report, at the top of the page, the first paragraph in this statement:

The committee has again reduced the operation and maintenance estimate in an effort to force some action on the part of the Bureau to turn the operation and maintenance of irrigation projects over to the local interests. Lethargy on the part of the Bureau and the failure of irrigation districts to promptly assume their responsibilities with respect to completed projects continues to be of principal concern to the committee. Until some evidence is given of a change in the attitudes existing with respect to this problem, the committee has no other alternative than to reduce the amount of funds requested for operation and maintenance.

I take it from what the gentleman said there that there is a lack of interest here on the part of both the Bureau and local interests which are supposed to supervise these irrigation projects. Is that true?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think to some extent that might be true. It is a very natural situation where the local interests do not want to take over that responsibility any sooner than someone requires them to do it, and as long as the Bureau of Reclamation has funds with which to carry on the operation it will not have the incentive to put the pressure on in order to get it turned over to the local interests.

Mr. SPRINGER. The effort of the committee is to exert pressure on the local interests to take the responsibility for these projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question is: Is that provided by law? I am not familiar enough with that to know. Does the legislation so provide that it shall be assumed by the local interest that recommended the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the general reclamation law; yes. That language refers to the Bureau of Reclamation, when a project is completed.

Mr. SPRINGER. At that point the local interest is supposed to assume the responsibility? Does that mean that they are supposed to assume the financial responsibility as well?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have contracts for repayment with the Government; yes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I ask the gentleman to refer to page 11 of the committee report referring to the area for Indiana. I notice there is no inclusion of the upper Wabash River Valley flood-control program. I would like to know whether or not this was reported to your committee by the Committee on Public Works or the Bureau of the Budget and why it is not included or was there any discussion of it within the committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The only way I can answer that is to say it was not brought before the committee for its consideration this year. I do not know what overall status of that project might be. But, the Bureau of the Budget did not submit it to our committee for consideration in connection with this year's appropriation.

Mr. BEAMER. I might explain that I think the Army engineers have placed it in class B, which I understand has their approval and there are certain things that have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget although the Army engineers have informed me that they have been pushing the Bureau of the Budget for approval. Do I understand that then it goes to the Committee on Public Works for approval before it goes to your subcommittee or your committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I could not answer that without knowing what stage the project is in.

Mr. BEAMER. I am asking the question because as the gentleman will note in volume 2 of the hearings, I appeared along with other Members, and together with members of the Indiana Flood Control Water Resources Commission on behalf of this particular program. The gentleman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN] appeared on behalf of the Mansfield Dam which is included. Of course, this other program is a \$43½ million program which entails the construction of three very large dams. But I wonder whether or not the gentleman or any member of the committee or the staff could probably inform me as to the status of that particular program at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to inform the gentleman. I do not know if any of the other members of the committee have any up-to-date information on that. You understand, of course, in addition to this \$12 million that is mentioned here, included in this program there is a huge backlog of billions of dollars of other projects in various stages of examination or survey or planning, or some huge backlog of projects for which the planning has been completed and which are awaiting construction. It amounts to several billions of dollars. And I do not know at what particular stage this project might be.

Mr. BEAMER. I would like to explain that I have received a letter from the Army engineers indicating that there are 37 of these projects which they have classed as class A. I think most of them

are probably in your recommendations for appropriations. However, they also said they have 43 projects of varying sizes that are in what they consider class B that have been approved by the Army engineers, but which have not yet received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I believe the Wabash River flood-control project, which is part of the Ohio River Valley program, is in that. I can secure the information, I think, probably from other Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If it has a favorable benefit to cost ratio, I assume it will be brought before the committee next year or some year soon.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is that the project on the Wabash River Basin?

Mr. BEAMER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Above the White River? There is \$20,000 in this bill for a general investigation.

Mr. BEAMER. No; there is another one. This is the upper Wabash including the Peru, the Mississinewa, and the Salamonie River dams.

Mr. TABER. Then this is not that one.

Mr. BEAMER. This is a \$43½ million proposal. You may not have reached that.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if it is authorized by law. Maybe it would have to go to the Committee on Public Works first.

Mr. BEAMER. That may be the explanation. It may not have been authorized by the Committee on Public Works. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], made his statement, he indicated that he placed everything in the bill that anyone had wanted almost, and that he was going to vote for all the others that might be presented. I am concerned about not seeing the 230 TV transmission line, Fort Randall, Grand Island, Nebr., in the bill. It was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department. That does not quite jibe with the statement the chairman made that they had placed everything in the bill that everyone had asked for. The Bureau of the Budget had asked for it. Can the gentleman tell me what happened to the budget request for funds for Fort Randall?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the chairman was speaking in general terms when he said there was everything in this bill. I think in general terms that his was an understatement. With respect to this specific project, all I can tell the gentleman is that it was considered by the subcommittee and a majority of the members felt that there was a question about the use of Federal funds to provide transmission lines for a purely public power facility.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department, and ap-

parently the subcommittee in their wisdom saw fit not to include it and recommend it to the full committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I expect to offer an amendment later on to restore the amount and will have some additional remarks at that time on that section of the bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to commend the committee for the recognition that has been given to the improvement of the Delaware River Valley, by an appropriation of \$6 million contained in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that the gentleman should not feel that there is anything unique about that sort of recognition in this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize it is something the committee should be commended for.

The Delaware River Valley is the fastest growing area in the United States from an industrial and population standpoint. It is therefore gratifying to realize that the Appropriations Committee has recognized its importance by providing an appropriation of \$6 million to commence deepening the Delaware River from the Camden-Philadelphia area to Trenton, N. J.

The Delaware River has become one of the principal arteries of commerce in the entire country. Its shores on both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the river are lined with numerous and varied industries. Many of them are known throughout the world by their products. Plans are already made for additional industries to be located on either side of the river.

A United States Army engineer's report, in recognizing the importance of the Delaware River as a means of facilitating waterborne commerce, has said:

The area tributary to the Delaware contributed the products of agriculture, mining, and a widely diversified field of processing and manufacturing industries. The local area is almost entirely industrial. It contains numerous manufacturing and processing plants that are of national importance in the character and volume of their products. In addition, a great number of smaller industries contribute a large volume and diversity of commodities.

It is astounding to realize the magnitude of the number and capacity of the manufacturing plants that are located along the shores of the Delaware River, and that utilize this waterway. There are more than 8,600 different manufacturing plants, most of which are located in the highly industrialized cities of Wilmington, Del., Camden and Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Chester, and Bristol, Pa.

Deep water all the way to Trenton will make available to industry upward of 60 miles of shoreline that can be utilized for a tremendous industrialization in the Delaware River Valley. Without the deepening of the river channel there can be no such development as is now planned. Already, with the mere pros-

pect that the river channel was to be deepened, great industries have taken options on land on either side of the river and plan to build immense plants that will give employment to thousands of workers.

The present channel is inadequate. It is not of sufficient depth to properly serve the industries that are already located in the upper Delaware Valley, and, until assurance is given that there will be increased depths, we cannot expect that there will be any great additional industrial expansion beyond what already exists.

As an illustration of what can be expected in the way of growth, the National Gypsum Co. is planning a multimillion-dollar plant in the Burlington, N. J., area, where it will manufacture building products for this area of the country. The company selected the Delaware River site because of the advantages the river, at a proper depth, provides for the transportation of the great quantities of raw material that are necessary in the conduct of the business of the company.

And, on the Pennsylvania side of the river is the beginning of what when completed will be the largest steel mill in the world. Already the Fairless Works of the United States Steel Co., in which has been invested \$500 million, is capable of producing 2,200,000 tons of steel per year. Present plans call for the expansion of this plant to double its present capacity. If present plans are carried out, it may be expanded to produce 10 million tons per year. To accomplish this will require great quantities of raw material to be delivered in large seagoing vessels that will require a deep channel. When we consider the value of such a plant to our country in a time of emergency, we certainly should not refrain from providing a river channel deep enough to enable it to operate at its greatest capacity and with the greatest efficiency.

Illustrations of the need of a deeper channel to enable large oil tankers and other vessels of deep draft to use the upper Delaware could be given in great number and variety. At the present time in many instances it is necessary to transfer the cargoes of these larger ships to barges to enable the delivery of such to industries located on the upper Delaware. It can be readily seen that this is an impediment to commerce and deters industries from locating in the area not served by a channel of sufficient depth to permit oceangoing vessels to deliver their cargoes.

The commercial expansion that is taking place along the Delaware River is evident from the figures contained in the official records of the United States Corps of Engineers. Their records show that there has been a 41-percent increase in cargo tonnage from the year 1952 to the year 1954—latest year available—for the Delaware River between Philadelphia-Camden and Trenton. The tonnage for 1952 was 6,949,933; the figure for 1954 was 9,828,355 tons. Not only is this a substantial gain, but the indications are it will continue and become greater with an assurance upon the part of the Government to proceed with the deepening of the river. The above fig-

ures are all the more significant when it is realized that during the same period both the ports of New York and Baltimore suffered a decline in cargo tonnage.

In this connection it is also well to realize the extent to which a deep waterway increases tonnage. For instance, the tonnage on the lower Delaware between Philadelphia and the sea is six times greater than that on the river above Philadelphia to Trenton. And, of course, it is easy to understand that the lesser volume on the upper Delaware is the direct result of the insufficiency of water depth in the upper Delaware. Therefore, the necessity of increasing the channel depth on that portion of the river is apparent.

If time permitted, it would be appropriate and beneficial to consider the extent of the improvements and expansion in industry that is taking place all along the shores of the upper Delaware, both on the New Jersey side and the Pennsylvania side of the river. Suffice it to say that the Federal Reserve bank has issued statistics showing that manufacturing industries in the Philadelphia-Camden area plan to spend \$228 million for plant expansion and modernization of equipment during 1956.

It would also be instructive, as well as interesting, to study the advantages that have come to our country where there has been development of deeper waterways. The particular areas where such have taken place give unmistakable evidence of the wisdom from an economic standpoint of the expenditure of Government funds in the development and improvement of our rivers and harbors.

I can predict with assurance, and no fear that the future would show otherwise, that the expenditure of the \$6 million in the present bill as a starter and following it the full amount to complete the deepening of the Delaware River will show results of increased income to the Federal Treasury from the business expansion that will follow, as to make it one of the best investments the Federal Government has ever made. I ask that favorable action be taken on the pending bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I rise to ask the gentleman a question which affects my district. I am asking this question because I have discussed it with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of the subcommittee, and others, to get information. On page 175 of the civil functions hearings, it shows under the heading of "Ohio" a tentative allocation of \$27,500 for survey work by the Army engineers in the matter of Mad River Hoffman Dam. Then, on page 5 of the bill, there is a general appropriation for this kind of work, a lump-sum appropriation; and on page 9 of the report these appropriations for general investigation work are referred to again. Can the gentleman tell me if the \$27,500 for that survey is still in the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who is perhaps more familiar with it.



Mr. RABAUT. The Mad River Hoffman Dam is in the bill, \$27,500.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is in that general estimate?

Mr. RABAUT. That amount will complete the study, as the gentleman has referred to, and that is the proper place, page 175 of the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank both gentlemen.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under your itemization of projects in California you have an item "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, \$485,000 for construction." Is that reimbursement to the city for dredging the east basin, or is that for the removal of the bridge on the west basin?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection is that that is the bridge, but I would like to ask the clerk of our subcommittee if that is correct. Is that for the bridges at Los Angeles and Long Beach?

Mr. RABAUT. We did not get the question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The question is that under California, Los Angeles, Long Beach Harbor, there is the figure \$485,000. It does not state whether it is for the dredging of the east basin or the removal of the bridge on the west basin. There are two projects there. We would like to know which this is for.

Mr. RABAUT. It is for reimbursement for dredging, and the bridge item is \$245,000.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I notice a statement about it on page 17 of the report: Removal of West Basin Bridge, California, and the statement that the Federal Government will assume 90 percent of the cost of the removal of the bridge. Is that 90 percent of the cost represented in the \$485,000 under the California itemization? There are two items and I am trying to ascertain which this represents.

Mr. RABAUT. The total amount of \$245,000 is carried as an item for the removal of the bridge.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And the \$485,000 is for reimbursement of the city for dredging the east basin?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There are two items listed there; that is correct.

Mr. Chairman, if I may resume for a couple of minutes, I think this bill will put us in the same position with respect to this program as we are in during the current year, and that is that there simply will not be the required supervisory personnel to do the kind of job Congress expects to be done in the handling of a public works program of this size and scope. I do not think the Corps of Engineers have the skilled personnel or perhaps the necessary funds under general expenses to handle a program which has been expanded much beyond what was contemplated at the time it was submitted to the committee.

I have no illusions about this bill. Even though I feel that there are many items in it that should not be in it, I know that any effort to cut them out on the floor of the House would be unsuccessful; in fact, I think most of the

members of the committee are on rather poor moral grounds in denying anyone the inclusion of his particular project because he can point to projects in the bill which are of less justification than most of those which could be offered from the floor.

I think the problem will be to hold the line to the present figures rather than attempt to reduce those figures.

I do not propose to get into any argument of philosophy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think that Congress is entitled to be assured that there are no duplication of facilities between the TVA and other Federal agencies. I think Congress is entitled to retain supervisory financial control over this or any other agency of the Federal Government so that we do not let them run wild in the use of funds which rightfully belong to the people of the United States. I think the same statement applies to any of the other agencies that are included in the scope of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

REMARKS IN COMMITTEE OF WHOLE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], for the manner in which he handled this bill in committee. I want to express the gratitude of the people of the New England area for the cooperation the subcommittee has given to the matter of flood control for that locality.

This public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 gives a total of some \$18 million for the New England area. This amount, coupled with more than \$2 million appropriated in the urgent deficiency bill last February, brings that total for the calendar year to more than \$20 million. This figure represents the largest amount ever appropriated in any one calendar year for flood control in New England. The cost of the authorized projects for flood control in New England total some \$351 million. Since 1936 the Federal Government has expended about \$70 million on these projects. The appropriation and expenditure this year of \$20 million is greater than any amount appropriated in any 1 year for the New England area. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to have some responsibility for this action. As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee, I listened to the testimony of the Corps of Engineers and all other witnesses concerning adequate flood protection in New England and the North Atlantic States.

When the devastating floods of August and October 1955 struck New England, I saw at first hand the havoc that was wrought. I visited all of the communities in western Massachusetts and in northern Connecticut to view the terrible destruction to property. As I recall, there were some 135 lives lost.

The Congress some years ago declared it to be a national policy to give assist-

ance to areas that have experienced the ravages of torrential rains and unleashed waters from small streams and large rivers. On that basis, a general overall flood-control program was established for New England. Due to World War II and the Korean conflict, progress has been agonizingly slow. We are now in a position where this program can and must be accelerated. The action that the Public Works Subcommittee has taken insures that acceleration. When Major General Itchner, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and Brigadier General Fleming, chief of the New England division, appeared before my subcommittee, I questioned them on the amount of money that could be reasonably used in fiscal 1957. Their reply was that the funds requested, plus some additions, would be all that could be reasonably used and which would tax the capabilities of the New England division to the utmost. This bill provides the necessary amounts plus the additions.

#### CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

Since the Connecticut River flows through my district, I have a keen interest in adequate flood-control protection for the Connecticut River Basin. I am satisfied that the Corps of Engineers is now on its way in providing that program. This bill carries moneys for construction on the Barre Falls, Otter Brook, Ball Mountain, North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend Reservoirs. These are all on the Connecticut River Basin. The Corps of Engineers has testified that planning and construction on these reservoirs is all that it could handle during fiscal 1957. These projects greatly accelerate completion of the program designed to give adequate flood protection to the Connecticut River Basin. It is my hope that for fiscal 1958 recommendations will be made for appropriations for additional reservoirs so that the program will be completed.

This bill carries an additional \$400,000 for hurricane studies. It also includes an additional \$100,000 for planning for West Hill Reservoir; an additional \$400,000 for flood protection in Woonsocket, R. I.; \$640,000 for the Thomaston Reservoir in the Naugatuck River in Connecticut; \$500,000 additional for the East Brimfield Reservoir on the Quinnebaug River. The Subcommittee on Public Works, in its wisdom, added these amounts when the bill was marked up.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat the gratitude that the New England delegation and the inhabitants of the locality have for the treatment accorded us. Damages caused by last year's floods in New England were the greatest in the history of this Nation, totaling \$700,000 million. Our area has come a long way in rehabilitating itself. This has been done by the cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities. Particularly do I single out the Corps of Engineers and specifically the New England division for the magnificent job it accomplished.

This committee, like all other committees of the Congress, has a very heavy responsibility. This is one place where money can be saved. There is no ques-

tion but that there is a considerable waste of money involved in many of the projects that have been recommended and undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This is particularly so in reference to navigation projects. I have some very firm convictions on moneys that are spent on navigation projects. It would seem to me this Congress and the Bureau of the Budget as well as the Corps of Engineers are getting pretty far afield in the matter of recommending navigation projects for every single tributary and river in the United States. I have no difficulty at all with navigation on the main stems, the Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Ohio, and other of the great rivers of the Nation. But I do have some difficulty in justifying certain navigation projects on the smaller rivers of this Nation.

It would seem to me that when the original framers of the Constitution sat down and wrote into the Constitution the commerce clause they did not intend that navigation be on every single waterway as this Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Corps of Engineers seem to indicate. There ought to be a reappraisal by the Corps of Engineers; there ought to be a reappraisal by the Bureau of the Budget in the matter of navigation projects, for the cost of navigation projects is paid by all of the taxpayers all over the United States. I have no difficulty with the flood-control projects. Those projects are also paid for by all the people all over the Nation. Where there is the question of the saving of lives, where there is the question of the protection of property, in my opinion, that money is justified for all of those projects that have anything to do with flood control. I have gone along with them, and I have gone along, too, with navigation projects that are feasible.

Let me say that I echo some of the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis]. He is and has been, at least from the time I have been here, for 4 years, the voice of conscience so far as this public works bill is concerned. The Congress needs a voice of conscience in matters of this kind. If we provided all of the money for projects that have been recommended or authorized by the Public Works Committee, the expenditure would run to some \$7 billion. There ought to be a reappraisal on some of the projects that have been authorized.

Mr. Chairman, this is a committee where you do not win friends and influence people. You lose friends and disrupt people. But it is a job that has to be done. It is a job that some do not like, but it is a job that Members of Congress have to do.

Again I express my gratitude to the chairman for the way he handled the committee and also to the other committee members.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Bailey].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, only the fear of a national catastrophe impels me to take the time of the committee and my colleagues of the House to discuss one item in this appropriation bill. I

refer to the Sutton Reservoir on the Elk River in West Virginia. This was first authorized by the Congress in 1941. Initiated in 1946, it was temporarily halted in 1950 due to the Korean war emergency. It was revived again last year with an appropriation of \$1,300,000. The present item in the budget calls for \$4,500,000.

Let me give you just a little reason why I personally as a Member of this Congress and as a Representative of that district in the Congress of the United States do not want to take the responsibility for what might happen. I remind you that during World War II the Government built two huge gas lines from the Southwest.

It just so happens that in the valley of the Elk River just below this reservoir are located two of the world's greatest natural-gas compressor stations. One belongs to the Hope Gas Co., and the other one belongs to the United Fuel Gas Co. Are you aware of the fact that compressor station belonging to the Hope Gas Co. has a capacity of 17,000 horsepower? It handles 335 million cubic feet of gas each day. The other station handles approximately 235 million cubic feet of gas each day. After the Government sold those pipelines to private industry, they extended gas lines to Richmond, Washington, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and to western New York. They have over 18 million domestic consumers using gas that passes through that one station. The other station has 4.5 million domestic consumers, it has 181 industrial consumers, and it supplies gas to 61 other gas companies for retail to the public and an additional 10 million consumers. So, if a flood accident should happen in this valley, which has happened several times in the last 30 years, enough to damage the John Cornwell station of the Hope Gas Co. \$3.1 million since the station was built, and you let another flood catastrophe hit that valley and find this storage dam not constructed, you are going to cut off the fuel supply of more than one-fourth of the people of this country. Think of it, gentlemen. I know you, as Members of this Congress, do not want to take that responsibility. I certainly do not want to take the responsibility of letting that situation longer exist in the district.

It was good business that you add \$2.2 million, to the \$4.5 million which the Bureau of the Budget cleared for that project, for this simple reason, that the contractors who were prepared to bid on it would have to bid \$2 million more for the project if there was not enough money to carry on the operation for a full year. They do not want it closed down for 4 months. It is a good business proposition. I am at a loss why the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, being businessmen as they are, could not see the business advantage involved in this proposition.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee at this time as to why you did not put this item in here. No I am not going to inquire into your reasons. I want to ask you just one thing. If the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a sup-

plemental item for consideration in the first supplemental appropriation bill, I want to know what the attitude of the committee is going to be. I can better govern my action here today if I can get an answer on that.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, naturally, if it was put in by the Bureau of the Budget, we would have to consider it.

Mr. BAILEY. Could I hope that it would have favorable consideration?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it would have to have the consideration of the committee. I can talk for myself only. I certainly would look with favor on a budget item in a supplemental bill which showed necessity for the project in that connection. I cannot speak for the whole committee. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire of the ranking minority member? In case the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a supplemental request to be handled in the first supplemental bill, will the committee look with favor on an item of the kind I have been talking about?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, I could not make any commitment of that kind. And, besides, as far as I personally am concerned, I would have to judge the project by the information that was furnished to the committee and by the witnesses that came before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, when the Congressman representing the First District of Kansas takes the floor in debate on the public works appropriation bill, I think probably every Member knows that he is going to refer to the project that has been turbulent in the First District of Kansas for some 15 years now, more commonly known as the Tuttle Creek Reservoir. My position in regard to the construction of Tuttle Creek is the same as it has been ever since its original authorization in 1938.

From a realistic point of view, however, since Congress in its wisdom decided to make a further appropriation in the first session in 1955 and since the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to include \$9 million in the bill before us today, I am not extremely optimistic of deleting that item. However, I do say, to make my position clear, that I am going to offer such an amendment later today.

I do not want to use the few minutes I have been given here today to discuss the merits of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. However, I should like to point out to the Congress some gross injustices that result to displaced persons when a Federal project is built. I am not blaming the Corps of Engineers for these injustices because they work only at the directive of the Congress. I wonder how many Members on the floor today who are attorneys know, if they happen to reside in one of these reservoir areas and the land is condemned, and they are



completely displaced, moved clear away, that they are given no reimbursement at all except a small amount of moving expense, perhaps a few hundred dollars. I wonder how many Members know that. I have talked to 2 or 3 today who have been here for 30 years, and they did not know it. There is no reimbursement to a businessman who is displaced because of a Federal public-works project. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is equitable. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to reappraise its whole policy on displaced persons in public-works projects.

Another matter has to do with the capital gains tax. Mr. Chairman, if you were 60 years of age and were a forced seller to the Federal Government under the threat of eminent domain, would you feel that you were being treated properly if you had to pay a full capital-gains tax, just as though you were a speculator dealing in land? Do you think that is right?

I have a bill pending in the Ways and Means Committee to readjust the capital-gains tax to unwilling sellers who are displaced because of public works projects. I sincerely solicit the support of every Member of Congress to look at that bill and I urge its favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. Let me say to the Members, do not forget that a project could be located in anyone's district at almost any time.

Even a more unjust practice has developed in the last 3 or 4 years in regard to land acquisition, known as the easement policy. At least, in prior projects, when the Federal Government took over real estate, and displaced persons in order to construct a Federal project, the land was acquired in fee title. The original owner got his money and was able to relocate his business at a place of his own choosing. That policy has been revised to the point where only a certain portion of a man's land is taken in fee title and paid for. The rest is taken under easement, if it is above a certain level on a reservoir project. What does that mean? It means that the property owner recovers a portion of his capital investment. Then part of it, a second portion he cannot recover and he does not have that money available with which to relocate, and maybe a third portion is above the water level, in a high area, maybe only 25 or 30 acres, and he gets a mere severance damage on that. He is not in a position to relocate his farming operation.

There is so much enthusiasm, I might call it sometimes blind enthusiasm, for Public Works projects.

I sincerely ask that every Member of Congress familiarize himself with the overall policy of land acquisition and cooperate with me or whoever may be directly involved in this matter in urging a more just consideration for displaced persons.

It has been said rather loosely that in the public interest these individuals just have to give way. If it is in the public interest that they are going to be deprived of their property by the right of eminent domain, they should be reimbursed by the public for the national good, too.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In respect to this project the gentleman has just been discussing, known as the Tuttle Creek project, over which there has been a lot of controversy through the years, the gentleman could very well, if he cared to do so, go into the terrible situation that exists because of the displacement of these people. There is the moving of 4 or 5 cemeteries, as I recall it.

Mr. AVERY. I think it was 13.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There are 13 cemeteries that will have to be moved. They will have to remove the bodies and take them somewhere else. Then, how many towns are there involved here?

Mr. AVERY. Five towns. There are about 100 businessmen involved in the five towns.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You are moving them out to just wherever they can go, leaving them to do the best they can?

Mr. AVERY. They are just being shoved out, reimbursed moderately for the real property that they owed, plus a slight moving cost that does not amount to very many dollars, but they are not allowed anything for their business interests, what have been described by the courts as consequential damages.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You would think from the testimony that appears in the record that there was not much opposition to this project, but there is a terrific amount of opposition to it. I realize that you cannot pay these people in dollars and cents what they are being damaged and what they are entitled to, but I agree with the gentleman that the situation is much worse than it is pictured here on the floor of the House. How much land is being taken over?

Mr. AVERY. Roughly 55,000 acres. That is the total amount of land. If they would buy all that land it would be more acceptable, but now they are not going to buy it, all they are going to do is take an easement on roughly 25 percent of it. The land is tied up, the farmer can use it, but he cannot get his capital out to locate himself in a place where he can pursue his normal operations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is outside my congressional district, but I have received a great deal of correspondence and had a great many people call upon me to suggest that what we should have done was provide a watershed program first and following that, if it is necessary, build dams to carry out the project, but not use a dam such as is proposed here, Tuttle Creek.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it takes no economics genius or certified public accountant or even a political science expert to be critical of this legislation. Unfortunately, however, buildings are not built by sidewalk superintendents, nor is beneficial legislation produced by critics.

Last evening I was reading a history of the Erie Canal. At that time a number of people proclaimed, "What is the idea

of building this canal through a wilderness?" Yet the Erie Canal resulted in the settling of the West, made the State of New York an empire within itself. The critics of that public-works project are lost in the oblivion of history, while the man who championed that legislation occupies a distinguished niche in our history.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Appropriations Committee, its members—both majority and minority—for making my committee assignments most enjoyable as well as interesting and informative.

If a survey were made as to what in Congress impresses a freshman Member of Congress most, I think that I would have to select as my answer the experience of observing men like the fair and affable chairman of our subcommittee, LOUIS RABAU, and the distinguished minority member, sagacious JOHN TABER, laying aside partisan politics in an attempt to legislate in the best interest of the entire Nation. Observing them, and the other members of the committee—both majority and minority—men from all walks of life, who could undoubtedly earn a great deal more material rewards in private life than in public life, overcoming sectional influence and appropriating for the benefit of the entire Nation, proves the merit of representative government.

The testimony before the committee by various administrative officials, public officers, and interested private individuals and organizations concerning the present and proposed public works of our country, discloses a bequest to the Nation that has to find its source in divinity.

After hearing the testimony presented to the committee, it would take a very narrow and completely unimaginative mind not to acquire an even greater devotion to our country. In the committee one is awed when he hears of the striking natural beauty of the United States—the Grand Canyon, the Rocky Mountains, Niagara Falls, and many other places of world renown. One is amazed when he hears evidence in the committee of the sources of the inexhaustible natural wealth of this country, vast stretches of farming and grazing lands, lakes, rivers, oilfields, mine regions, and vast forests. Facts presented to the committee concerning the great industrial centers, with their extensive manufacturing plants, the high buildings, great bridges, and vast projects for supplying power, light, and irrigation, give eloquent evidence of the genius of our people.

It is fitting to recall that the instant appropriation is more than an expenditure of taxpayers' funds. It is the investment of taxpayers' funds in the development of the assets of the people. No other Federal expenditure of funds produces more economic good to our people than does the expenditure that is involved in this appropriation.

As I sat on the committee I wondered where this country would be and what would be the economic condition of our citizens if our Congress had not entered into the field of investing the taxpayers' money in the development of the natural resources of our country? It would take

no historian to come to the conclusion that the Nation would not have had its ports, the complete electrification of our country, lands made fertile by irrigation, and its inland waterway system.

We are at the point in our history of facing the responsibility of not only paying for the just demands of our people upon their Government, but also paying for the greatest defense expenditure any Nation has had to bear. The only conceivable way to meet this great burden upon the people of this country is for their Government to prudently develop the great gift God gave this country in its natural resources, its oil fields, its mines, its farm and grazing lands, and the rest.

Of course, in carrying out this responsibility one realizes that the investment in the natural resources of the country—like any other investment—must be made in contemplation of present income. I think that in this proposed appropriation the members of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee have done a fair job in prudently viewing the annual income with respect to the amount of annual investment that ought to be made in the development of our resources. Although the amount of the appropriation is a staggering sum, when one stops to consider that the amount we are appropriating for our investment in the development of our resources represents less than one sixty-fifth of the total budget for this fiscal year, he realizes that the committee is most frugal in its appropriations for the public works of our country.

To those who might feel disappointed that some project in which they were interested is not included in the appropriation, or who might feel the committee was remiss, I would like to recall that no board of directors of any private corporation in the world, no trustees of any trust fund, regardless of their size, has ever had the responsibility or authority to make the annual investment that this committee was required to recommend in the instant appropriation.

In helping the subcommittee and committee in effectuating its powers and responsibilities, the committee staff, various administrative officials from the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and others were of invaluable assistance.

As the guide in assisting this subcommittee in making the largest investment any investor ever embarked upon, is the Bureau of the Budget. One would assume, and in a large measure this assumption is correct, that the Bureau of the Budget in making its recommendations, after the accumulation of all supporting data concerning the public projects of the Nation, would recommend those public projects that will most benefit the entire Nation for the amount of money that it appears the Nation might be able to expend for such purposes during the fiscal years.

I was disappointed in some of the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget because it appeared to me that its recommendations were not predicated upon criteria based upon the economic welfare of the country but rather upon sectional favoritism. I

would like to point out one particular and documented illustration.

Testimony before the committee in the northwest area discloses a serious situation with respect to power. As a matter of fact, evidence before the committee discloses that there is a power shortage in the northwest area. Plans of the administration or plans of private utilities fail to disclose the possibility that this power shortage will be overcome in the years to come. The northwest area has as a natural resource one of the greatest power producing waterways in the world—the Columbia River. To meet its power shortage the Northwest area has a combination of power companies including public and private utilities that have been described as one of the most efficient power combinations in the world.

The Bureau of the Budget, or other administrative agencies, have failed to recommend to the Congress any plans or suggested appropriation to meet the increasing critical power shortage situation in this area. If the failure to request funds to meet the power shortage situation in the northwest area were predicated upon the lack of available funds or an absence of plans, one could well appreciate and concur in the Bureau's budgetary views.

However, in another area where there is no shortage of power one observes the Bureau of the Budget recommending vast appropriations for a power project.

It seems to me that the recommendation of a power project in one area where the supply is available, and denying it to another area where the supply is inadequate, is not a budgetary practice based on sound fiscal principles.

In making its recommendations to the Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers use a formula in which they determine the benefits to be derived from the proposed project as related to its costs, calling this ratio the benefit to cost-ratio. All of the projects appropriated in the instant appropriation have a benefit to cost-ratio which guarantees some return on the investment this appropriation represents.

In determining benefit-to-cost ratios, the various administrative agencies allocate the cost of the projects to the various features of the project, including power, water, irrigation, and the like. In March of 1954, an agreement was made between the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission with respect to allocations of cost in connection with multiple-purpose projects which included power.

Under this agreement power features in a proposed multiple-purpose project are considered after a determination of the factor of taxes foregone. The feature of taxes foregone is an arithmetic computation to determine the amount of taxes which a private utility of like power-generating potential would have paid. On some projects, such as the McGee Bend Reservoir in Texas, it was represented to the committee that the power features of the dam predicated upon the criteria which utilized the aspect of taxes foregone, is not economically justified. However, in two other

cases the various administrative heads, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, have represented to the committee the economic feasibility of multiple-purpose dams with power predicated upon allocations to power which do not include the criteria of taxes foregone.

It may be good politics but I think it is bad budgetary logic, or lack of coordination to utilize one method of cost allocation for a dam in one section and another method for some other multiple-purpose project.

I was particularly impressed before the subcommittee with the presentation made in connection with the Calumet-Sag project in the city of Chicago and the Great Lakes connecting channels.

#### CAL-SAG PROJECT

The Cal-Sag project lies in south Cook County, Ill., and at present has a 60-foot channel, 9 feet deep, connecting the Illinois Waterway system with the Lake Calumet industrial area in the city of Chicago.

This area produces more steel than any other area in the world and is one of the world's principal industrial centers. The committee has authorized \$8.5 million for the continuation of the proposed program of widening this channel to a channel of 225 feet in width. The present 60-foot channel has an efficient capacity of 1 million tons of commerce. The present commerce in the channel is three times its present efficient capability.

An excellent case was also made in connection with the Great Lakes connecting channels which, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway will improve navigation in the Great Lakes area to a point where vessels with drafts of 25.5 feet can safely use the Great Lakes connecting channels as opposed to the current limiting drafts of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound. Completion of this project will allow free and safe movement of the large vessels presently used in Great Lakes commerce, including those vessels anticipated to move into the area as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The long overdue improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels and the Cal-Sag project will make Chicago the crossroads of the world's commerce. It is appropriate to recall the words of a prominent Philadelphian who, after viewing the phenomenal rise of the city of New York as a result of the Erie Canal, wrote in a letter in 1851: "Transportation is king. Neither cotton, coal, nor any other product is sovereign. Conditions that fix the cost of transportation to market fix the amount in value of the products and their place in the commerce of the country."

These words are as true today as ever before.

One can well appreciate the reason one of our great local newspapers in the city of Chicago—the Chicago Tribune—recently stated that within 25 years after the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway system Chicago will be the greatest city in the world. For with the completion of this waterway system Chicago will have achieved the distinction of



being the transportation center of the world.

One disappointing feature in this appropriation is the failure to include amounts for deferred maintenance. Unless we maintain our existing projects, our national investment is in jeopardy. The postponement of essential maintenance in order to initiate new projects is, at best, a poor policy. An example of what happens if maintenance is deferred or postponed over a long period of time is accurately disclosed in connection with the Lake Calumet project near my own district. This project was completed in 1937 at which time the harbor at Lake Calumet at the end of the Cal-Sag Canal was dredged to an authorized depth of 21 feet. Since that time no maintenance was had on the harbor. As a result of the lack of maintenance, the 21-foot depth decreased to 15 feet.

In the past 2 or 3 years considerable traffic has developed in Lake Calumet harbor and a great amount of local interest has been generated in the harbor.

As a matter of fact, the Chicago Regional Port District has recently sold, and sold very quickly, bonds in the amount of \$27 million to develop this port. Obviously, we must be assured that our present projects and proposed projects are maintained in such a manner that at the period of their greatest use they have not been left in such a neglected state as to render them unusable.

Although I understand there are adequate funds in order to complete the deferred maintenance in Lake Calumet, I hope that the Senate will include adequate amounts to begin the deferred maintenance upon our other national projects.

I urge the enactment of this appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my California colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. As the gentleman knows, we have a project in my district known as the Redwood City Harbor.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have heard of it.

Mr. YOUNGER. There was one authorization in 1945 which called for no local cooperation and one in 1950 which called for local cooperation. In the 1955 budget a million dollars was provided for that project. The Appropriation Committee took it out on the ground that local participation was not available, yet all of the money asked for was for the 1945 authorization. That leaves the project in such shape that the Bureau of the Budget will not consider it because of the position taken by the committee, and the committee will not consider it because it is not in the budget. I want to know from the committee if it is necessary to combine authorization requirements when an appropriation is made which is limited to the work in only one authorization.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has asked a rather difficult question. The best thing I can do is to read to him

that part of the report made by the engineers on the project, at the request of the subcommittee. And I read:

A substantial proportion of the tonnage through Redwood City Harbor is carried by deep-draft vessels requiring 30-foot depths within the harbor and approach channels. Such vessels are subject to the hazardous condition of maneuvering in channels limited to 200 feet in width and 27 feet in depth. In addition, vessels cannot safely enter or depart under full load except at time of extreme high tide. Such conditions are very detrimental to efficient movement of cargo and limit harbor development.

Then there is a note:

NOTE.—There is no local cooperation required for the modification contained in the 1945 River and Harbor Act. Local interests, however, have voluntarily provided the necessary spoil-disposal areas and impounding works required for that dredging.

That would answer the gentleman's question, that the gentleman's project could be cleared for action sometime in the future.

Mr. YOUNGER. If the Bureau of the Budget put the item in, the committee would consider it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think without question I should say definitely it would be considered.

Mr. YOUNGER. The fact that the local participation was not available for the second authorization would not deter action on the appropriation for the first authorization, which did not require local participation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It seems to have been straightened out, from the engineers' report.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. I note on page 7 of the report that the sum of \$451,000 which was programmed by the Bureau of Reclamation and budgeted for the Oahe unit in South Dakota has been eliminated. Can the gentleman tell me why this amount was eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am in a difficult position, as the gentleman knows, because I was ill during a part of the time the hearings were held. I was not there when this matter was taken up, but the record shows, as the gentleman knows, that the Congress has already appropriated over \$5 million for the investigation of that project, which would seem, I think, to be adequate before a report is made. The committee has instructed the engineers to finish and submit that report and to take the necessary money out of the general investigation fund. I think the gentleman will agree that that should be the next step before any further money is appropriated.

Mr. LOVRE. Then it is the intent of the committee that the Bureau should make a full report of its findings now before any additional money is appropriated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I so understand.

Mr. LOVRE. In the gentleman's opinion, will there be sufficient unobligated balances in connection with the basin investigations program to carry out the instructions of the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. There are funds on hand for completing such an investigation.

Mr. LOVRE. I would like to know how many acres can be irrigated in the James division of the Oahe unit and where; what can be expected in the way of returns on the irrigated lands; how much will it cost the Federal Government; how much will it cost the farmers for participation, and if the project is economically feasible. Will we be able to get this information from the report that is contemplated by the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman talks like a member of the subcommittee. Those are the things we should like to know, too.

Mr. LOVRE. If additional funds are necessary in order to accomplish this job so that we can have this information, will your subcommittee give this project further consideration at the proper time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The committee gives all projects full consideration as far as it can, and I would say very liberal consideration.

Mr. LOVRE. In other words, if the gentleman will yield further, as far as the action of this subcommittee is concerned on withholding funds this year it was done without any prejudice to the project itself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly none on the part of this member and I think I may say none on the part of any member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LOVRE. If it should be discovered that the Bureau needs additional money to carry this project to its logical conclusion before the other body acts on this bill, would be the gentleman object?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; speaking as one member of the subcommittee, I would not object.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, as a taxpayer and as a citizen of South Dakota, I want to know just how many acres of land can be irrigated in this project. I want to know what the costs will be and certainly want to know that the entire project is engineeringly feasible. I am in hopes that the preliminary reports to be completed this year will show these things.

At the end of this fiscal year, approximately \$5,042,729 will have been expended on this report. It is anticipated that the entire report will cost in the neighborhood of \$8 million. I do not believe that it is the intent of this committee to leave the project only five-eighths completed, which would be a very unfortunate waste of money. On the other hand, the committee has a right to know, and I want to know, just what progress has been made with the \$5 million already expended.

The farmers and townspeople in my district have questions, and lots of them, in regard to the feasibility of irrigation. For over 8 years they have been going to the Bureau trying to get answers to the questions and even after all this time the answers have not been available. Farmers and others have asked me many questions and invited me to meetings to

discuss irrigation, but I just haven't been able to answer their questions because the Bureau has not released any substantial authoritative information.

Mr. Chairman, if this project is not feasible, I do not want it in my district. If the costs per acre are too high or if the land will not take the water, the project should not be started. I do, however, insist that the people of South Dakota have a right to the answers to their questions and if the project is feasible, I want the project started. I hope that the action of this committee will spur the Bureau officials into much faster action than we have had in the past. The Congress and the people of South Dakota are entitled to this information as soon as possible.

I have been led to believe that the action of the committee will not prejudice this project, but is merely an effort to check on a Bureau which seemingly has been negligent about keeping the Congress and the people advised as to where the previous appropriations have been spent. I should like to include here a telegram I received today from Mr. Bruce Campbell, managing editor of the *Huronite* and *Daily Plainsman*, of Huron, S. Dak., in regard to this project:

HURON, S. DAK., May 22, 1956.

Representative HAROLD LOVRE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Justification for \$451,000 for Oahe unit is primarily that money is needed to assure that a specific project proposal is given to people of South Dakota. That sum is needed to make sure that previous \$5 million in 10 years isn't wasted since interim report is synthesis of previous work. Field work on report may be done by target date of July 1, but probably not. In any event, after field work completed, all additional work of evaluating, analysis and cost figuring must be done by successive echelons of Bureau. If given approval after few months, Oahe unit needs maintenance of planning unit to prepare detailed report. Sum of \$451,000 is \$100,000 less than \$550,000 allotted this current fiscal year because Bureau realized that it would be in transition period for few months and could get by on less than this year's amount, although it may pinch, year ago Bureau had panel of three experts conduct soils test, they found large area drainable. But Bureau still has never told people of South Dakota what specific area would be irrigated, what project proposals are exactly, has never given explanation of economics and feasibility of project. Until Bureau does this, people of South Dakota have not been treated fairly. This planning money of \$451,000 is sums which will assure South Dakotans of getting clear, definite picture of project proposal, area, costs. Mere report resting on bureaucratic desk somewhere won't do people of South Dakota any good or help Congress which has financed preparation of data. Money needed to make sure report is completed in all phases, then that project proposal is explained to public. South Dakotans agree with committee that Bureau has dragged its feet on making decision, but believe that this \$451,000 is necessary to get that decision, then get it explained and applied to big Great Plains area where rainfall is less than 19 inches.

Pattern follows same report pattern that obtained in North Dakota on Missouri-Souris.

South Dakotans don't need to be sold on irrigation; they are turning to it steadily on their own. But they want action on such a big program that would help stabilize agricultural production.

In 1949 there were only 12 sprinkler irrigation systems in State. End of 1955 there were 225 sprinkler irrigation systems, mostly in central South Dakota area, generally believed to come within scope of Oahe unit.

In 1880 were 189 irrigators on 15,715 acres, mostly western South Dakota, in 1930 were 763 on 59,361 acres, in 1950 were 807 on 78,069 acres.

This week in Onida, group of farmers ranchers that area plan to hold second such grassroots meeting to see if they can organize any kind of a district to encourage Bureau to get going faster on irrigation plans. It generally understood that 80,000 acres may be in that general area.

Foregoing is information from our background, from local Bureau people, from State water engineer Joe Grimes.

Can't get statement from any Bureau official. Regional director Frank Clinton, who definitely has favored project, is somewhere in Arizona unreachable on vacation.

BRUCE CAMPBELL,  
*Huron Daily Plainsman.*

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dawson].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Would the gentleman explain to me the reason the committee cut the request of \$8 million for the Colorado project as requested by the Budget to \$3,500,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I would be glad to, because I do not want the gentleman, or any of my colleagues, to have any misunderstanding on the subject.

It is the policy of the committee, and I concur in the policy, not to appropriate money for construction during a fiscal year if it can be avoided when that money will not be spent during that fiscal year.

It appeared from the record, and from the testimony which I think I should say to the gentleman was rather limited, the testimony on the subject, it appeared to the committee that this money for actual construction would not be needed during fiscal 1957; therefore, the committee gave all of the money requested, as we understood, for planning and preparation of plans, all of that money, but did not allow money which we understood was requested for actual construction and not needed in fiscal year 1957.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I believe there was some testimony to the effect that money would be needed for the construction of access roads and dam-site housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman is right, and I think that that was overlooked in setting the figure at \$3,155,000.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I assume if that information is supplied to the other body there would be no objection to restoring that amount.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly not from me, and I feel there would not be from any other member of the subcommittee. I may say, however, that we would want, so far as possible, to determine the actual amount of money needed for the construction of roads and housing before we set the figure or appropriated for it. The money for access roads I think

is justifiable, but I think we should be very careful in appropriating money for housing that we do not run into some of the problems we did in building so-called model housing units such as that at Boulder City and Hanford. We should let the contractor supply his housing, and we should supply only the housing necessary, possibly of a more permanent character, for Federal employees. It is my belief that is what the bureau is requesting.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is exactly what the request was from the bureau.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we should be careful.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice funds for the Missouri River Basin transmission division program are allowed with the exception of \$5,500,000 for the Fort Randall-Grand Island line, which is a 230,000-kilovolt line which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Could the gentleman give me any light as to why that was left out?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish I could. I did not know that I was to become an authority on the entire public works bill as seems to be the case this afternoon. As the gentleman knows I was not present at all the hearings because I was ill, and I did not hear all the testimony. My understanding is that the item was probably removed because Nebraska has chosen to be a self-reliant and a self-financing State on power. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We are a public power State.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that what the gentleman is saying in other language?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. We have to come to the Federal Government for money for our light plants and our REA's. This is a feasible project that was recommended to the Bureau of the Budget and every dollar will be paid back.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just cannot answer it. I wish I could.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. Can the gentleman give me some information with reference to the Quinnipiac River project at New Haven?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot pronounce it, let alone give the gentleman any information on it.

Mr. CRETELLA. It is an Indian name.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand that.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.



Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear in behalf of the people of Connecticut and New England on matters which are of vital importance to their welfare and protection from the ravages of floods, erosion, and storms.

Connecticut is still digging out from the ruins left in the wake of the August and October storms of last year. In emergency session the State Legislature appropriated \$73 million for assistance to those faced with the burdensome tasks of rebuilding their homes and their businesses.

You have heard a joint statement from all 12 New England Senators and from those in the State of Connecticut who work very closely with the problems of floods and are well acquainted with our needs in this regard. I want to subscribe wholeheartedly to these statements and ask that they be carefully and sincerely weighed.

Congress has wasted little time up to now in providing financial aid in the urgency deficiency bill so that a program could be initiated for the construction of dams and reservoirs and other projects.

This Committee now has before it President Eisenhower's request for additional funds which would accelerate the flood-control program in the northeast region in addition to hurricane studies under Public Law 71 and projects for shore protection and improvement.

There is no doubt that millions would have been saved in Connecticut alone if the various dams and projects had been completed in time to bear the forces of our storms last year. It was estimated by the State that the \$207 million loss in the Naugatuck Valley could have been reduced by \$90 million if the Thomaston Dam had been built. The Naugatuck Valley is one of the most vulnerable in the entire Northeast area to floods and the losses in property and the human misery which occurred there last year should provide ample incentive for Congress to appropriate additional funds as sought by the President.

Although the United States Army engineers have taken active interest in New England flood-control projects, the overall results have been more or less disappointing. This can be attributed to the neglect of Congress in failing consistently to appropriate funds for vital authorized projects. Of the many projects authorized since 1938 only 5 structures have been built thus far although the present budget includes funds for additional work.

New England appears to be increasingly prominent in the paths of recent hurricanes and floods. If we are to have an accelerated program of flood control, Congress must take into consideration the greater and greater jeopardy to which the residents of Connecticut and the Northeast are being subjected. Appropriations of several million dollars even over and above that figure recommended by the President would be put to good practical use. It is expected the Corps of Engineers will

recommend new and additional projects to be undertaken as a result of further studies which are being made to come up with a sound program of flood control. Increased funds for fiscal 1957 could be very economically put to use for such expansion.

A project which has been authorized since 1945 in the 79th Congress is the deepening of the Quinnipiac River. The completion of this project would greatly help in lessening the needs of business and commerce in the area which depends on adequate channels for shipping. Industry has grown in New Haven and a good portion of the population depends on the success of companies established on the Quinnipiac River. The great majority of these businesses have indicated their desire to expand their facilities when the deepening of the river is completed. In the original House Document 517 the tonnage shown was 480,000. The present tonnage is 946,141.

Maintenance dredging in New Haven Harbor is to be undertaken soon. Considerable economy could be effected by deepening the adjacent Quinnipiac River at the same time. It would be first necessary, of course, for this committee to appropriate the necessary funds for the Quinnipiac River project. I hope in the interest of a stronger economy in New Haven and the State of Connecticut that these funds will be made available immediately for this purpose.

One of the shore-erosion projects for which funds of \$42,000 were appropriated for fiscal 1956 was Woodmont, in the district I represent. The start of construction, however, has been delayed and it appears no work will begin before the deadline of July 1. I urgently request that this appropriation of \$42,000 be included in the 1957 budget so the project can be carried out. State and local interests have contributed \$150,000 toward the costs. There is a real need in Woodmont for shore-erosion protection and I trust the committee will see fit to include this item in the budget.

Connecticut has continually demonstrated her energy and initiative in defense against the threats of storms, and erosion, and the willingness to help provide suitable navigation and harbor facilities. I hope the interest in these matters as displayed by the citizens of our State will be fairly recognized by the committee and that sufficient funds will be made available so that we can go forward with an accelerated program as a means of protection to the residents of Connecticut from the forces of nature which have thus far taken such a ghastly toll of lives and personal property.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I understand that these two dams, the Glen Canyon Dam and Flaming Gorge Dam are a considerable distance from highways.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We quite often build dams some distance from highways.

Mr. HILL. You have to in that rugged, mountainous area. But when I

discovered that the fund had been reduced from \$8 million down to \$3 million for this particular year the question occurred to me: How can we ever expect to get these highways constructed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the point just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dawson]. I concur that there should have been some money put in for access roads, whatever we actually need in the fiscal year. I am not for appropriating money that will not be spent in this fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. This Glen Canyon Dam is 135 miles from the nearest town or a good highway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The upper basin States are going to do something about these roads also.

Mr. HILL. I understand there is to be a cooperative arrangement between the States and the Bureau; at the same time the State is not very apt to start these highway programs unless they know funds from the Government will be forthcoming.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can the gentleman tell me how much the other States are to contribute to those roads?

Mr. HILL. In my own State, we have always contributed percentagewise somewhere near 50-50. At the same time that is not the answer. What would be the attitude if the other body should decide to replace this \$5 million? That is not a small sum because \$5 million is a lot of money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a lot of money to the gentleman and myself but sometimes I think it is not considered to be a lot of money when we bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the President submitted a budget request for \$8 million for the upper Colorado River storage project for fiscal year 1957. This request included plans and specifications for 2 of the dams—Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge—as well as advance planning money for some of the other authorized units.

Both of the dams are some distance from any present highway and roads need to be built immediately for access to the sites. The access road from United States Highway 89 to the Glen Canyon Dam site is in very rugged mountains and is estimated to cost about \$4½ million. I understand the Bureau of Reclamation expects to have specifications ready to award a contract for this road as soon as construction money is available. The Bureau is required to state in its specifications the amount of money available for contract earnings at the time it advertises. It seems essential, therefore, that construction money be available July 1 for this work to get underway.

Glen Canyon Dam site is 135 miles from the nearest town and therefore re-

quires construction housing and some permanent housing for operation employees. The Bureau plans to use trailers and portable houses so far as possible, but it is impossible at present to even get a trailer to the site because no roads exist. Contracts would be awarded within a few months for some housing, office space, warehouses, and so forth.

I am advised that a contract for diversion tunnels is planned to be let about April 1, 1957, and construction funds in the amount of at least \$1 million should be available in January 1957 so that the estimated amount of contract earnings can be included in the specifications when they are advertised.

A similar situation prevails at Flaming Gorge Dam site where roads, construction camp, and diversion tunnel contracts will be ready for advertising shortly after January 1, 1957, and construction funds for payments under these contracts should be made available to the Bureau of Reclamation now.

The advance planning money is, of course, essential to complete the planning on other units so that an orderly development can proceed on this project, which was overwhelmingly approved by the House a few months ago.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman want a road or a dam?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I have studied this record quite carefully and I can understand how the gentleman from California and the members of the committee might have some reservations here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope the gentleman will understand that I am not arguing the merits of this project either in the committee or here. I have done the same thing with a project in my own district. I have approved taking out money that could not be spent in the fiscal year.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand and I commend the gentleman for that. I was trying to get an idea of what would be expected in the way of further information to justify this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the information would be, what actual work is to be done, the contributions of the States and how much will be needed in the fiscal year 1957. Incidentally, there is the matter of when the construction contracts actually will be ready to be let.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Yes, as to contracts for construction of the diversion tunnels, there is the difference as appears in the hearings between April 1, 1957, and February 1, 1957. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if the information mentioned is supplied in acceptable form, the committee would be inclined to look kindly on it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, yes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman would be inclined to?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, I would not object. The gentleman also realizes a statement that the money might be used in the last quarter is not definite enough.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand that. It should be pinpointed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have about exhausted my time. I just wish to say that I took the floor, Mr. Chairman, to point out a few facts regarding the expenditures of TVA, for example, that TVA, while it has been referred to on the floor as being a self-reliant and self-financing agency, actually it has not even returned to the Federal Government the amount of money which the Federal Government has paid in interest for TVA's money over the same period of years, or less. I just think that this is neither the time nor the place to attempt to discuss that subject fully.

I would like to say in the remaining minute that I have been on the subcommittee which makes that budget for 10 years, but I have never in that time heard anyone say they wished to destroy the TVA. I have heard them say they wished the TVA would recognize the fact that it has in itself the inherent strength to conduct itself as an independent agency, self-financing, self-operating, and to act as if it were grown up. I think that is a subject for which time should be taken on the floor of the House to exhaust the subject thoroughly so that we would not be subjected to a statement like the one I referred to, which said that the TVA was not costing the taxpayers 1 cent. The records of the Congress show that that is not so, nor is it true that the TVA is returning all the money it should return to the Congress, when the records show it returned less than the interest paid by the taxpayers on the money advanced to the TVA. The TVA paid back \$127.5 million, and simple interest alone on the money advanced TVA for power construction alone, would be more than \$200 million, both figures to June 30, 1955.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and members and the subcommittee hearing these proposals on their splendid action in providing for needed flood control projects. The amounts provided for Success and Terminus Dams in my district by this bill represent a start on construction of two worthwhile projects—a construction which has been delayed for various reasons over a period of years.

In order that you might have a complete picture of these projects I will summarize certain major aspects thereof as follows:

#### SUCCESS RESERVOIR, TULE RIVER, CALIF. AUTHORIZATION

The Success project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and op-

eration of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document 559, 78th Congress, which contains the latest published map.

#### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Success project consists of a dam and reservoir for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Tule River and Tulare Lake areas. The dam is to be located on Tule River about 5 miles east of the town of Porterville, Tulare County, Calif., and will be an earth-fill structure 146 feet high and 3,430 feet long across the Tule River, with an auxiliary earth-fill dam or dike 40 feet high and 6,300 feet long across Frazier Valley about 3½ miles northwesterly from the main dam. It will create a reservoir of 75,000-acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located on a natural rock saddle about 1,000 feet northwesterly from the main dam, and will be ungated. The total estimated cost of the project, based on 1955 price levels, is \$13,900,000.

#### PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 75,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood-control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

#### PROJECT BENEFITS

The Success Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 60,000 acres of agricultural and suburban lands along the Tule River and its tributaries and to the Porterville urban area, which has a population of about 10,000. It will also improve the irrigation water supply by providing about 10,000 acre-feet of new water through reduction in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake, and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. Most of the area to be protected is highly developed farmland, devoted primarily to the production of fruits, truck crops and cotton, and to alfalfa and irrigated pasture for stock feed. In conjunction with the constructed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Terminus Reservoir on Kaweah River, the Success project will help to provide flood protection to about 260,000 acres of highly productive agricultural land in the Tulare Lake area. Data on major floods and flood



damages from rain floods in the Tule River area and from snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

Date	Peak flow at Worth Bridge		Flood damages below dam site from—	
	Natural (cubic feet per second)	Modified by project (cubic feet per second) <sup>1</sup>	Natural flow <sup>2</sup>	Modified flow
<b>RAIN FLOODS</b>				
February 1936.....	14,000	1,200	\$1,000,000	0
February 1937.....	13,000	3,200	800,000	0
February–March 1938.....	14,000	1,000	1,130,000	0
March 1943.....	21,100	3,200	2,060,000	0
November 1950.....	28,000	500	1,340,000	0
January 1952.....	5,500	500	31,000	0
December 1955–January 1956.....	17,000	500	2,600,000	0
<b>SNOW-MELT FLOODS</b>				
March–June 1938.....	\$ 85,000	\$ 5,000	1,650,000	\$100,000
April–June 1952.....	\$ 30,000	\$ 0	620,000	\$ 0

<sup>1</sup> Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Tule River below dam site.

<sup>2</sup> Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.

<sup>3</sup> Acre-feet.

<sup>4</sup> Estimate of volume of Tule River inflow to Tulare Lake under present conditions of development.

<sup>5</sup> Damage in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Porterville has been flooded several times in the past, most recently in November 1950. A repetition of the 1950 flood with current conditions of development and prices would cause damages of \$1,340,000 in the Tule River area below the dam site, of which about \$130,000 would occur in the Porterville urban area. Damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flooding from the Kings, Kern, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers, have approximated \$39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amount to about \$76 million. The flood of April–June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the Tulare Lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at \$7 million (current prices) of which about \$620,000 could be assigned to Tule River flow, on the basis of volume of inflow. The December 1955 and January 1956 floods had lower peak flows than the flood of 1950 but they flooded 44,000 acres of agricultural land below Porterville and caused far greater damage than the flood in 1950. Considerable land was badly eroded and other lands were covered with sand and silt. Orchards, crops, and improvements were severely damaged. In Tulare Lake, damages attributable to Tule River water were estimated at \$200,000. The Success project would provide adequate flood protection to the Tule River area below the dam site and would assist materially in reducing damage in Tulare Lake. The project would also improve the annual irrigation water supply to the highly water-deficient Tule River area and would provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

Flood control.....	\$659,000
Irrigation.....	68,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>727,000</b>

The average annual charges are \$590,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1.

#### LOCAL COOPERATION

Payment is to be made to the United States by local interests when use is made of the stored water for conservation purposes, but no local cooperation is required for the construction of the reservoir project. Costs for the conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Improvement by local interests of the maintenance of existing channels and diversions under project conditions will be necessary in order to increase the capacity for disposal of excess waters, (primarily by channel percolation and over-irrigation) in the Tule River area. Cost of additional maintenance of channels and diversions is estimated at \$18,000 annually. General assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements for local cooperation.

#### STATUS

Design studies are about 80 percent complete. Construction plans and specifications are about 30 percent complete. By the end of the current fiscal year the design studies should be about 85 percent complete and construction plans and specifications should be about 35 percent complete. Planning required to initiate construction will be completed with funds currently available. Construction work has not been initiated.

#### TERMINUS RESERVOIR, KAWEAH RIVER, CALIF. AUTHORIZATION

The Terminus project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and operation of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document No. 559, 78th Congress which contains the latest published map.

#### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Terminus project consists of a dam, reservoir, and spreading works for flood

control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Kaweah River and Tulare Lake areas. Terminus Dam is to be located on Kaweah River about 20 miles east of the city of Visalia, Calif. The spreading works are to be constructed in the valley below the reservoir. The dam will be an earthfill structure 220 feet high and 2,680 feet long across Kaweah River and will create a reservoir of 145,000 acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located in a natural saddle about one-half mile south of the dam and will be gate controlled. The spreading areas will range in size from about 300 acres to about 2,000 acres, and will be for the purpose of spreading floodwaters to assist in flood control and to replenish the ground-water basin for subsequent pumping for irrigation. The absorptive capacity of the spreading works will be about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The reservoir will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water a year through reductions in evaporation losses and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. The total estimated cost of the project, based on the 1955 price levels, is \$18,600,000.

#### PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 145,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

#### PROJECT BENEFITS

The Terminus Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 110,000 acres of agricultural lands in the Kaweah River area and for the city of Visalia and adjacent urban area with a population of about 20,000. It will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water annually for irrigation through reductions in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation water supply. The spreading works portion of the project will assist both flood control and water conservation by recharging the ground-water basin with floodwaters, and will have an infiltration capacity of about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The agricultural lands to be served by the project are particularly well adapted to the production of fruits, nuts, truck crops, cotton, and stock feeds. In conjunction with the completed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Success Reservoir on Tule River, the Terminus project will help to provide adequate flood protection to 260,000 acres of croplands in the Tulare Lake area.

Data on major rain floods and flood damages in the Kaweah River area, and

snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

Date	Peak flow at McKay point		Flood damages below dam site from—	
	Natural (cubic feet per second)	Modified by project (cubic feet per second) <sup>1</sup>	Natural flow (dollars)	Modified flow (dollars)
<b>RAIN FLOODS</b>				
February 1937.....	19,000	1,200	720,000	0
December 1937.....	35,000	1,000	1,030,000	0
March 1938.....	15,000	1,900	620,000	0
January-March 1943.....	17,000	1,900	930,000	0
February 1945.....	15,000	1,200	595,000	0
November 1950.....	54,000	1,100	1,340,000	0
December 1955-January 1956.....	73,000	5,500	12,500,000	0
<b>SNOW-MELT FLOODS</b>				
March-June 1938.....	\$424,000	\$410,000	\$4,350,000	\$210,000
March-June 1952.....	\$4145,000	\$40	\$1,960,000	\$0

<sup>1</sup> Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Kaweah River below dam site.  
<sup>2</sup> Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.

<sup>3</sup> Acre-feet.

<sup>4</sup> Volume of inflow to Tulare Lake.

<sup>5</sup> Damages in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Visalia has been flooded by the Kaweah River several times in the past. The most serious flooding in recent years was during December 1955 and January 1956. These floods had the largest peak flow of record with 73,000 cubic feet per second and a 5-day volume of about 130,000 acre-feet. Nearly three-fourths of the city of Visalia was flooded by the December flood and about half of the city was flooded by the January flood. Most of the city area covered by the January flood had been damaged by the December flood, but some of the area had escaped the December flood. Damages caused by these floods are being surveyed and only tentative estimates are available at this time. Damages in the city of Visalia are in the order of \$3 million, and damages in the Kaweah River area, including the city of Visalia, are estimated at \$12.5 million. The Kaweah River flood plain is an outwash cone formation with the riverbed usually on the high part. The flood washed out river control structures and cut new channels, thus damaging roads, utilities and nearly 200,000 acres of agricultural lands. Some lands were severely eroded and others were left buried under a heavy deposit of sand, silt, and debris. About 9,000 acres were flooded in Tulare Lake with damages of \$500,000 attributable to Kaweah River water. Flood damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flows from the Kaweah, Kings, Kern, and Tule Rivers, have approximated \$39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amount to about \$76 million. The flood of March-June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at \$7 million (current prices) of which about \$1,960,000 could be assigned to Kaweah River flow on the basis of volume of inflow; \$1.9 million of this damage would have been prevented with the project in full operation. The Terminus Reservoir, with the other reservoirs of the plan, would assist in preventing such damages from occurring in the future. The removal

of the flood hazard will stimulate larger growth of industry in the city of Visalia and in the remainder of the Kaweah River flood plain. The reservoir and spreading works will improve the supply of water irrigation.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

Flood control.....	\$1,662,000
Irrigation.....	253,000
Total.....	1,915,000

The average annual charges are \$855,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 2.2 to 1.0.

#### LOCAL COOPERATION

Local interests are required to make payment to the United States for the conservation features of the project and to operate and maintain the spreading works after completion. The amounts to be repaid for conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of the spreading works is \$22,000. Assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements. Local interests have constructed and are operating some of the spreading works contemplated by the project.

#### STATUS

Planning accomplished to date consists primarily of field explorations and surveys required for definite design studies. Preparation of the design memorandum to be used as a basis for the construction plans and specifications is about 30 percent complete and is expected to be about 50 percent complete with funds currently available. Except for plans prepared as part of the definite design studies, no construction plans and specifications have been prepared. Construction work has not been initiated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 14 of the report on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957, funds have been recommended and allocated for the improvement of the Dela-

ware River, one of our country's major lanes of commerce.

An allocation of \$1,060,000 has been recommended for the improvement of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea. The other allocation is for \$6 million and authorizes the deepening of the Delaware Channel from 25 to 35 feet.

The foresight of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations has made it possible for me and my colleagues from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to appear on the floor today and request that these two allocations be favorably voted upon and passed without further delay.

As most of you know, we have battled tirelessly during the past year and a half to obtain the approval of these projects by the Congress. We have been particularly concerned about the \$6 million allocation needed to initiate the deepening of the channel inasmuch as it was contained in the budget recommendations to the Congress in January.

In March of this year my colleagues and I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee in support of this allocation for construction. At that time I pointed out the obsolescence of the Delaware Channel and emphasized the fact that our continued growth and prosperity depended largely upon the building of a more modern channel to adequately accommodate the present ocean traffic. I believe I was, to a degree, successful in proving to the committee that the Delaware River today is outmoded and instead of providing a vital link in our transportation system, it is a hindrance to profitable trade. I further pointed out the need for an improved channel in the interest of national defense.

We Members from Philadelphia and our colleagues from New Jersey and Delaware have presented every possible argument in favor of the deepening of the Delaware River.

We realize these projects will greatly enhance our valley's prosperity—and this I am for—but my main concern is safety to ships and the saving of human lives, which cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Since the deepening of the channel will provide greater safety to all vessels calling at the port of Philadelphia and make our port facilities more attractive to foreign trade; and since the deepening of the channel will minimize the navigational hazards and thereby insure the lives of all seamen; and since the deepening of the channel will assure increased prosperity for the Delaware Valley and guarantee greater employment through the establishment of new industries along its banks, I sincerely urge that this body vote unanimously for the immediate passage of the public works appropriation bill for 1957.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I gladly embrace this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and its able members as well



as the entire Appropriations Committee for so expeditiously considering and reporting this most constructive bill.

The measure involves extremely complex engineering matters requiring long intensive study and I congratulate the committee for its patient, laborious, able work which has been so conspicuously crowned with success.

In my opinion this bill is not only unique with regard to the speed with which it has been reported to the House in view of its complex subject matter, but from the standpoint of my district, State and area, it represents the greatest step forward in Federal flood-control legislation since the inception of this government.

In behalf of all my people, in behalf of the people of Massachusetts and the members of our special Massachusetts Delegation Committee on Flood Rehabilitation and Relief and, of course, in my own behalf, I desire publicly to express my deeply felt appreciation to all the members of the committee, its staff and the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget and all others who have contributed to the formulation and presentation of this highly meritorious measure.

The presence of this bill here on the floor today is living proof of the adaptability of this body, and the ready response that can usually be found here, to great public emergencies such as confronted us in the great, devastating floods which ravaged the Northeast last summer and fall.

This measure has laid a speedy and indeed sound foundation for many projects of extreme urgency. It will go a long way in affording the kind of protection which our area will require in the future. It will go a long way toward preventing the recurrence of the great disasters that have been periodically visited upon us during torrential equinoctial storms and hurricanes by raging waters in our river valleys and in other places sweeping everything before them and causing great loss of life and tremendous damage to property and creating havoc, confusion and privation in our communities.

The committee action is unique in another way. In its commendable zeal to meet these problems speedily, for one of the few times in the history of this Government, the committee has cut the red-tape and bureaucratic delay that frequently attends the development of these matters, and has acted across a broad front and in a courageous way to extend relief and provide flood prevention.

We understand, of course, that as splendid and constructive as this bill is, further action will be required by the Congress as we go along in order to assure adequate safeguards and complete protection. The major projects have been, in the main, very well established and should go forward with all practicable promptness. To be sure, there remains a great deal of work still to be authorized and still to be achieved before our area will be adequately protected against floods.

Some of this work can be accomplished by the Federal Government acting alone

and some of it will be the subject matter for joint action between the Government, the States, and the local communities.

As to that part of it which is the legitimate concern of the Federal Government, extensive surveys, reviews and studies which the Congress has already authorized are now proceeding. The end results of these activities will enable the Congress to know from an engineering and operational viewpoint as well as in complete detail where additional work is required, its nature, character and scope, and by what feasible means it can be accomplished.

Some of this work can be done under existing authority. For much more, additional authority is being sought. The McCormack bill, H. R. 9554, and its companion, the Philbin bill, now pending before the House Public Works Committee and already approved in principle by the Secretary of the Army reflecting the view of the Corps of Engineers, will greatly broaden the amount of work that can be done by the engineers without coming back to Congress for additional authority. They would raise the limit up to \$500,000 for any one such project, and it will readily be seen that this figure more realistically approximates current needs and would promote greater speed and efficiency in coping with emergencies.

It is measures like these which will be the answer to the alleviation of a large variety and number of water resources and water flowage conditions, not only in the northeast area, but throughout the Nation.

In my own district, for example, the basic projects established in the Quinebaug, French, Blackstone, and Ware Rivers will be of infinite flood protection help. There are still many conditions that have come about, and which periodically come about, as a consequence of floods which can only be dealt with by smaller local projects and engineering and construction of a preventive nature in and along these river channels, having to do with removal of rubbish and debris, diking, straightening, deepening and widening of the channels and general rehabilitation work affecting also the tributaries and feeding sources of these rivers which will have to be done independent of and regardless of the construction of major dams and reservoirs.

The Quaboag River is an illustration of this type of need. The recent floods necessarily altered the plans of the engineers for a major project to control the waters of this river at West Brookfield. However, the engineers having already done considerable remedial work along this stream are carefully studying ways and means to effectuate complete control to prevent recurrent damage along its course and particularly at the confluence of the Quaboag, Ware and Swift Rivers with the Chicopee River at Three Rivers where throughout that entire area real control problems exist.

The Nashua and Assabet Rivers are other types where this type of control could be effectual and this is also true of the streams in the Milford area where the State is already going forward with

coordinated projects. In fact, in all the river basins in Massachusetts a great deal of work of this character is needed and must be performed. It is my purpose to continue to apply my most vigorous efforts to all these needs and I will earnestly seek the cooperation of the House regarding these additional authorizations and appropriations. These many projects and required public works will certainly have my constant and unflagging attention.

It is true that the local communities and the States in the exercise of their primary responsibilities over streams and waterways will undertake a portion of this work. But a considerable portion of it lies beyond their resources and much of it falls under authority of current Federal mandates already given by the Congress. In the event that some of the projects are completed by State and local governments—many have been—there is still a very wide area for the implementation of the general, overall surveys in river basins and the efficient coordination of this work with soil erosion and soil utilization, antipollution, recreational uses, improvement of public water supplies and other projects looking toward the fuller control and utilization of water resources.

For these reasons, the Congress must and will, I am sure, continue its interest and very substantial support of these objectives by Federal planning and grants for the actual work. I think that we must take a broad, long-range view, not only of the more urgent, immediate needs, but also of the many desirable objectives of community development, area and regional development by the States under the overall guidance of the Federal Government, which will so manifestly promote increased prosperity, economic and social advancement as well as greater safety against disasters of the Nation as a whole.

While we can all feel a real sense of satisfaction with our progress to date, there are still serious and difficult problems to be solved, which will call, not only for steadily expanding operations by the Corps of Engineers, but also require for their solution the adoption of a suitable plan for disaster and flood insurance.

I think such a plan is of the utmost importance. On several occasions I have elaborated my views respecting disaster and flood insurance before the House, and before committees of both branches of the Congress. I do not wish to go into the matter extensively here, but by way of emphasizing this reference to the question, I would most respectfully suggest and urge that our House committee continue to give its diligent attention to pending bills including my own, providing for disaster insurance, and particularly flood insurance, and exert every effort to consider, and if deemed desirable, which I hope it will be, to broaden and extend the measure already adopted by the other body, in any event to report some suitable bill at a very early date.

Before I conclude, I am very anxious also, as chairman of the Massachusetts delegation flood committee, to extend my

sincere and deep thanks to the press and its representatives in my district and State and, in fact, in many other places, for their very valuable assistance in presenting our urgent needs arising out of the terrible floods to the people. This warm interest and wide coverage on the part of the press of the disaster, its aftermath and the emergency character of the need for relief, rehabilitation, and permanent protection has been one of the truly effective instrumentalities contributing greatly to the results achieved up to this time.

Let me say to you, my friends and colleagues, that I will ever be grateful for your many expressions of sympathy for my stricken people, for your warm interest and your whole-hearted cooperation and for your most helpful efforts which have brought the power and resources of our great Federal Government in such substantial degree to the assistance of so many distressed peoples and communities and which are bringing the reality of complete protection against such disasters closer day by day. If we but continue this vital work, many lasting benefits are bound to flow from it and our entire Nation—its well-being and welfare—will be the better for what this Congress has done and will do in the time ahead.

Control of floods in Massachusetts, particularly in the Worcester County area, is a step nearer reality today with House action on the flood-control appropriation bill.

The engineers asked for \$340,000 for the beginning of construction work on the East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir during the fiscal year 1956-57, which starts July 1. The committee increased this amount by one-half million to \$840,000.

In addition, the committee advanced flood control in the Blackstone Basin by providing \$100,000 in planning funds subject to State concurrence for the West Hill Dam and Reservoir on the West River below Upton.

The committee's action is almost unprecedented in approving the West Hill planning funds because of a standing congressional rule of not providing Federal funds for projects which lack State concurrence or approval. In addition, the engineers in testimony before the Appropriations Committee indicated that inclusion of West Hill in this year's budget would tax the ability of the Corps to do the planning work because of the heavy workload involved by other New England projects.

A public hearing has been called for May 24 in Upton by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce on the West Hill project. The department in turn submits recommendations to the Governor, who concurs or withholds approval of Federal flood-control projects in the State.

Following is a breakdown of the \$4½ million Federal allocations for central Massachusetts:

East Brimfield, \$840,000; Hodges Village, \$360,000; Buffumville, \$1,200,000; Barre Falls, \$1,150,000; and Worcester diversion, \$840,000; all construction projects.

West Hill, \$100,000, for the preparation of engineering plans and specifications.

Blackstone Basin, \$10,000 for a continuing survey at a total cost of \$40,000. Last year \$20,000 was provided to begin the survey.

The Massachusetts delegation urged the Appropriations Committee to provide planning funds for the Westville project near Southbridge. The engineers, however, placed a higher priority on the East Brimfield project, also designed to protect Southbridge, because that construction will cut down on the difficulties of building Westville, since a cofferdam will not have to be built at the Westville site.

The Buffumville project is located on the Little River in Charlton about 5 miles above Webster. The engineers have set June 1958 as the target date of the \$2,820,000 job, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the rolled-earth fill-type dam, which will be 66 feet high and 3,255 feet long upon completion, will take place in May, 1957, when the Little waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 220-foot concrete spillway for overflow will be provided.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June, 1958, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,400 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 12,700 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 11,300 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

Hodges Village, to be completed in February, 1959, will cost \$4,350,000, all in Federal funds, including land taking costs. It is on the French River in Oxford about 6 miles above Webster. The dam, with height of 55 feet, running 1,140 feet along its length, will be closed in May 1958. The entire project will be completed in February, 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until November 1958. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide a water storage area of 13,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains.

Buffumville and Hodges Village are 2 of 7 flood control projects authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on Buffumville, Hodges Village, and East Brimfield. The latter project is located on the Quinebaug River in Sturbridge and is designed to furnish flood protection for Southbridge.

With the \$100,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Buffumville, the engineers plan the following work:

Initiation of road relocation, \$89,500; engineering and design, \$1,000; supervision and administration, \$9,500.

Beginning July 1 the \$1,200,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Land acquisition, \$150,000; relocate pipeline and utility, \$53,200; continuation of road relocation, \$150,800; initiate

construction of outlet works and dam, \$739,000; engineering and design, \$15,400; supervision and administration, \$91,600.

The \$360,000 appropriation for Hodges Village will be used for:

Initiation of railroad relocation, \$179,000; engineering and design, \$152,500; supervision and administration, \$28,500.

#### WARE RIVER JOB

The completion date for the Barre Falls project is November 1957. It is located on the Ware River in Barre and will cost \$2,680,000, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earth and rock fill dam, which will be 62 feet high and 885 feet long, is scheduled for August 1957, when the Ware waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A concrete weir and chute-type spillway, capable of discharging water at the rate of 16,300 cubic feet per second, will be provided in the construction.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir are expected to be completed this month, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide 24,300 acre-feet of water storage in time of heavy rains.

The Barre Falls project is designed to protect Ware, Three Rivers, and downstream points on the Chicopee River as it flows into the Connecticut.

With the \$300,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Barre Falls, the engineers plan the following work:

Land acquisition in reservoir area, \$2,000; initiation of construction of the outlet works of the dam, an access road and utility buildings, \$271,000; engineering and design, \$4,000; supervision and administration, \$23,000.

Beginning July 1, the \$1,150,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Road relocation, \$25,100; reservoir clearing, \$30,000; continuation of dam construction, \$986,400; permanent operating equipment, \$1,500; engineering and design, \$10,000; supervision and administration, \$97,000.

The West Hill project is located on the West River above Uxbridge. Its estimated cost is \$2,730,000, all of which would be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking. The proposed reservoir would control a 28 square-mile drainage area and would have a storage capacity of 11,900 acre-feet. It would provide a high degree of protection to points on the lower West River and would have considerable flood-reducing effect at downstream points on the Blackstone.

The East Brimfield project, which has June 1959 as the target date for completion, will cost about \$5,700,000. It is located on the Quinebaug in Sturbridge. All costs will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earthen fill type dam, which will be 55 feet high and 510 feet long upon completion, will take place in August 1958, when the Quinebaug waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 140-foot concrete spillway



for overflow will be provided. Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,200 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 30,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 28,800 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

The East Brimfield project is 1 of 7 flood-control dams authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on three others in the basin: East Brimfield, Hodges Village Dam in Oxford and Buffumville Dam in Charlton. The latter two projects will provide flood protection for Webster.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, the city of St. Louis is the only metropolitan city on the Missouri or Mississippi Rivers that lacks adequate flood control protection. Four times within the last decade my city has been visited by disastrous floods. The last was the Kansas-Missouri flood of 1951 which resulted in losses exceeding a billion dollars. During the last session of the Congress a bill was passed authorizing \$130 million for a project to control the floods in and around St. Louis. That bill was passed unanimously. There was not a vote against it.

In the current appropriation bill there is an item on page 13—and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee to it—for the planning of this flood control project in the amount of \$551,000. The total cost of the planning work will be \$1.2 million. Actually this is about \$649,000 short of the total cost. If the Bureau of the Budget could be persuaded to submit a supplemental request for an additional \$649,000 to complete these plans, I wonder if the committee would look with favor on that request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's inquiry on the item for St. Louis flood protection, the budget estimate was \$551,000, with which it is proposed to protect an area of something like one-third of a million acres and 600 business firms and business enterprises against destructive floods, and particularly in view of the imperative nature of the menace of the situation I will say that the committee will be glad to consider any further estimates the Bureau of the Budget may send up. As a matter of fact, such estimates would be not only imperative, but mandatory.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield to the ranking minority member if he would care to comment on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not going to be in a position to say whether I, as an individual Member, would look with favor on any proposition until it has been submitted to the committee. It would be giving a blank check, and,

as I have said very frequently on this floor with respect to appropriations, I do not favor that.

Mr. KARSTEN. I might say to the gentleman that he has already committed himself to \$551,000 and I was wondering if he would be willing to go the rest of the way.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to make that kind of commitment without knowing all of the facts.

Mr. KARSTEN. The fact of the matter is the Committee on Appropriations has, in this bill, committed itself to providing funds for the planning of the St. Louis flood wall. Funds for only half of the flood wall are of no value in preventing a flood. It would appear to be uneconomical to plan a flood wall on a piecemeal basis. It would seem a more desirable procedure for the Bureau of the Budget to request sufficient funds to complete all of the planning work within the next year in order that the construction work can be started.

As the chairman of the committee has indicated he will be glad to consider other estimates which might be sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, I propose to ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the matter to see if a supplemental request could be submitted for \$649,000 which is the balance that will be needed to complete the plans for the flood wall. If the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers can be persuaded to do this, I hope the request will receive favorable consideration by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the whip of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill as brought to you today by the House Committee on Appropriations, contains \$500,000 to begin construction of a tremendously important project to Oklahoma and Arkansas—the Eufaula Dam. It contains a like amount for the very important sister project—the Dardanelle project in Arkansas.

The Eufaula Dam, which is a key unit in the comprehensive Arkansas Basin development program, would be on the Canadian River 27 miles above the confluence of the Canadian and the Arkansas. Because of the great silt-retention capacity it would have, the Eufaula Dam is an essential element in the development of the Arkansas River for navigation purposes.

You perhaps recall that Congress voted \$450,000 last year to complete engineering plans and to make a start on construction of Eufaula. Thus far this administration has seen fit to impound these funds so that there has been no construction at all. It is my opinion that in this case the executive set itself above the expressed legislative will of Congress; and, in my opinion, the executive branch exceeded the authority it has under the Constitution. We have

reason to believe if Congress again acts in this matter, the executive will allow the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction.

I regret that the committee did not see fit to provide more than \$500,000 for Eufaula in the next fiscal year. I think more money might be spent wisely on this project in the next 12 months. However, I am going to accept the committee's figure because I am so anxious to get this program started that I don't want to quibble over the amount.

Since an element of controversy has been introduced in connection with construction of this dam, I would like for a moment to review its history.

It was authorized by Congress in 1946. The improvement plan provides for flood control, hydroelectric power, and sediment control. This is one of those rare projects that can be justified even under the policy of this administration regarding hydroelectric-power dams.

The concrete and earth-filled dams will be 3,180 feet long and will rise 112 feet above the streambed. The reservoir will have a storage capacity of 1,428,000 acre-feet for flood control; 1,379,000 acre-feet for the generation of power; and it will provide a permanent pool of 897,000 acre-feet for sedimentation reserve, recreation, and preservation of wildlife, a total of 3,074,000 acre-feet. The estimated cost of the project is \$153 million. It will take about 6 years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said before, the Arkansas is the last great river basin in the United States which has not been developed. We in Oklahoma and Arkansas are proud of the great developments along other major streams in this country—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Columbia, and many others. We feel that the time has arrived and is even overdue when the 4 million citizens of the great States of Arkansas and Oklahoma should begin to enjoy the fruits of river development.

This is a region blessed with tremendous resources, many of them as yet untapped. The greatest coal reserve in the midcontinental area of the United States is the Arkansas Basin. Some of the greatest oil- and gasfields in the world are in this area.

One of the chief deterrents to development of these resources to date has been the high cost of transportation. When the Arkansas River is open to navigation, I foresee the dawn of a new day for those who live in this area. Our people then will be in a far stronger competitive position; our area will be far more attractive to great and expanding industries.

Eufaula Dam will help meet the growing requirements for electricity in this area; it will help meet the ever-increasing demands for water for industrial and municipal purposes. It will help control the floods that almost every year exact a heavy toll from farmers and others who have property along the banks of the Canadian River.

Finally, some of the great defense establishments of our country are located in the valley of the Arkansas and its tributaries. Development of this basin will

be an investment in the security of our country, and in the security of the free world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my gratification over the inclusion of items for the Dardanelle and Eufaula Dams in the pending bill. As part of the comprehensive development plan for the Arkansas Basin, the Appropriations Committee has voted \$1 million for the sister projects of Dardanelle and Eufaula. This marks the continuation of congressional policy to promote the multipurpose development of the Arkansas River, a program which received initial approval in the 1946 act authorizing construction. Last year the Congress appropriated \$450,000 for Dardanelle in fiscal 1956, and with new funds for 1957 I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will be able to proceed with its construction.

It is only just and right that the last major river in the United States to remain undeveloped is at last to receive its fair attention. The Army engineers' plan for multipurpose utilization of this water resource was authorized 10 years ago. In 1950 there was an appropriation of \$1 million to start construction of the Dardanelle Dam, but the Korean conflict intervened and all work on the project was suspended. Some of the \$450,000 appropriated last year was used to complete planning, and the Army engineers are ready and able to carry forward the construction work. While under the Budget Bureau's old formula the benefit-cost ratio was impressively favorable; the ratio is still favorable even under the rigid new formula A-47. Thus these projects are a real investment for the United States and will bring the Nation rich dividends in the course of time.

The Dardanelle Reservoir will be located on the Arkansas River about midway between Little Rock and Fort Smith. The project is a major unit of an integrated system to serve navigation, develop hydroelectric power, stabilize river banks, provide flood control, and other related purposes. Hydroelectric power facilities at Dardanelle Dam will consist of 4 units with a total installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. The storage capacity would be 495,000 acre-feet, of which 70,000 is for power and 425,000 for navigation. The total estimated cost of the project is \$94,600,000. Not only would this money provide these benefits, but it would also contribute to the realization of the vast potentialities of the Arkansas Valley. Such realization will obviously be accelerated by the availability of cheap transportation and electrical energy. Industrial development will be based on utilization of vast quantities of coal, oil, timber, bauxite, and rare minerals in the region. The 4 million people in the Arkansas Valley will then be able to contribute more substantially to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri,

chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON], and other members of the committee who have preceded me, have fully covered the major items in the pending public works appropriation bill. This bill carries recommended overall appropriations in the amount of \$787,453,000 to speed the work and services of the various agencies for which the funds are needed in the public interest.

It is always stimulating and refreshing to work with the members of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee. Service on the Appropriations Committee, at times is taxing and arduous, but it is also rewarding and I would like to take this opportunity to again express my thanks and appreciation to our chairman, Mr. CANNON, and to our subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, and all of the members of the committee for their kindness and helpfulness. In fact, I should like to commend all members of the subcommittee, in addition to Mr. CANNON and Mr. RABAUT, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the minority members of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

This bill, as reported, carries funds for the management and operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers. This bill can truly be called an all-American measure because of the diversity of the projects included in this appropriation. The public-works development of our Nation will move forward and as a result of the money provided in this bill our country will be made stronger and our national defense strengthened.

Mr. Chairman, having heard the testimony throughout the hearings on this bill, one cannot escape without being impressed with the great public-works program of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies.

Our committee has heard testimony and sympathetically considered projects for all areas of the country—the New England basin, the South Atlantic basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the upper Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley of California, and, in fact, projects in all areas of our great Nation.

I was particularly impressed with the program to be undertaken in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. The plan there is to dredge a canal from the

St. Lawrence River which will extend more than 250 miles into the heartland of our country and connect the great city of Chicago, making it a port city.

In addition, plans are underway to build 32, I repeat 32, hydroelectric power-producing units within this project on the St. Lawrence River, 16 on the American side and 16 on the Canadian side. These are in addition to the 5 major power projects—2 privately owned and 3 Government owned—in this great area.

Similar public works projects are planned in the upper Colorado Basin, the Columbia Basin, in the great Northwest, and in other areas of our country.

In the past the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a controversial item of the public works appropriation bill. However, this year, the appropriation for this great agency should not be controversial because there is no money included in the appropriation for expansion of TVA's power facilities or steam plants.

Not a dime is included in this bill for new power-producing projects for this agency.

The appropriation further should not be controversial because it is by far the smallest appropriation submitted to Congress in the 23-year history of TVA. The 1957 appropriation of \$5,357,000 is 20 percent less than the \$27,053,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year. The amount of new funds for fiscal 1957 represents a 77 percent reduction or cut in appropriations for this agency since 1955.

Notwithstanding these cuts and reductions, critics of TVA continue to harass and attempt to curtail TVA's operations.

The critics of TVA say that TVA should stand on its own feet. If there was ever an indication that TVA is standing on its own feet, it is signified in this meager appropriation request. It is a further indication that this agency is being operated in a most efficient and economical manner. As indicated, the budget for TVA for next year does not carry one dime of new money for additional power—for new starts for the system. The funds recommended herein are for navigation, flood control, and general operations—not for power.

The TVA power program is standing on its own feet. It is paying its own way—and it is paying dividends—big dividends into the Treasury. Annual payments into the Treasury through 1957 will have exceeded \$285 million. The navigation and flood-control programs of TVA are also paying dividends—in the form of increased river traffic and commerce and the saving of human lives and property.

Yes; the history of TVA is a wonderful story of joint partnership between the people of a vast region and their Government—the Federal Government—a partnership which has combined the industry and ingenuity of the citizens of a great 7-State area into harnessing rivers and streams—working for the betterment of the economic standards of our Nation.

TVA power was used to build the first atomic bomb—there was no place else in the United States prepared and ready to meet the gigantic requirements for the Oak Ridge project. Today, with the atomic and hydrogen age bearing more



heavily on us, TVA is still in the forefront—meeting the defense demands of this Nation with its power supply.

While TVA critics continually harp on TVA's power achievements, little is ever mentioned by these critics of this agency's great flood-control program which has saved millions of acres of valuable farmlands from the upper reaches of the Tennessee River—into the Ohio Valley and to the lower basins of the Mississippi.

Nothing is said of the lives saved by TVA's control of floods which once ripped through the southeast with almost the same consistency as the spring rain.

Little, if anything, is said of the economic benefits derived from improved river traffic and commerce.

Nothing is said of its soil-testing program which has resulted in untold benefits not only to the farmers of the valley but to farmers in more than 20 other States participating in TVA's farm test demonstration programs.

TVA's chemical research aids not only agriculture, but industry as well and the national defense. It should be pointed out that TVA's chemical research and production facilities are an important segment of the national defense program.

During World War II, TVA supplied more than 60 percent of the elemental phosphate used by our Armed Forces.

It delivered for munitions production more than 97,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia and ammonium nitrate and ammonium crystal.

For almost a year during the Korean fighting, TVA supplied the entire elemental phosphorus requirements of the Department of Defense.

Resources development in the area supplements but does not duplicate similar programs of the Department of Agriculture and other areas of Government service.

Included in TVA's resource development program is a great reforestation program, tributary watershed development, topographic mapping and agriculture conservation—the promotion of our Nation's resources.

There is recommended in this bill \$1,150,000 for this work—with only \$400,000 to be provided by new appropriated money. The amount is small, the return is great.

Efforts are being made to attack this portion of TVA's appropriation on the ground that these services are duplications of programs carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The TVA's resource development program, I repeat, does not duplicate the Department of Agriculture programs.

During hearings on this portion of the bill, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, asked Chairman Vogel if there was duplication by the TVA and the Department of Agriculture. Chairman Vogel answered that TVA does work in close cooperation with the Department of Agriculture just as in the field of navigation and flood control TVA works with the Corps of Engineers.

In all cases—

Chairman Vogel testified—

we are trying to bring in local organizations to the maximum extent, utilizing the agencies of the States and the colleges in the region, hoping thereby to develop a sense of local responsibility and hoping that this feeling will be transmitted to adjacent regions. (Public works appropriation hearings for 1957.)

Later, Mr. RABAUT asked Chairman Vogel the specific question:

Does TVA duplicate the work of the Department of Agriculture in this area?

Chairman Vogel replied:

No; I do not think there is any duplication. (TVA hearing, 1956, p. 230.)

Mr. A. J. Wagner, General Manager of TVA, further answered this question when he said:

This activity of TVA in the Tennessee Valley is a kind of activity that is not generally available in the rest of the country. But it does not mean that there are greater Federal expenditures in the Tennessee Valley than there are in the rest of the country as a whole. We have looked into that question and satisfied ourselves about it. So that if the question you had in mind that this is something special in addition resulting in greater total expenditures than in the rest of the country, I believe the answer to that is "No." (Public works appendix, hearings, supra.)

Later in the hearings, Chairman Vogel again testified concerning TVA's cooperation with other agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service and again stated:

I do not believe there is any overlapping of consequence.

As we all know, the President and the Department of Agriculture recently recommended the extensive soil-bank program. Legislation to implement this program has been adopted. The appropriations committee has approved appropriations in excess of \$1 billion to finance authorized payments under this program. Embraced within this idea is to take land out of production and plant seedlings. Such a program will require the fullest utilization of TVA seedling production. TVA's seedling nursery is capable of producing 15 million seedlings a year. While the Clinton nursery is in operation, the Muscle Shoals, Ala., plant has been closed for several years because of lack of funds.

This work could greatly augment the soil-bank program because of the definite shortage of seedlings needed for reforestation in taking lands out of production. Commercial nurseries cannot, I am advised, supply the present market—not considering the future demands. This is a vital and needed program and, therefore, should not be curtailed but expanded and continued.

Mr. Chairman, with the reaffirmation of TVA's authority to use needed surplus funds and with approval of the pending bill—modest though it is with new appropriated funds—TVA will be able to continue to contribute to resource development and conservation, promote navigation and flood control of the area and keep step with the needs of vital defense

installations dependent upon TVA as an essential source of power supply.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that any threatened power shortage will strike at the very foundation of the atomic defenses of our Nation. The atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge is entirely dependent on TVA power. The Atomic Energy Commission installation at Paducah, Ky., requires more than 60 percent of its power from the TVA system. Other defense installations such as the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center in Tennessee, and the great guided missile center at Huntsville, Ala., are also totally dependent on TVA power. More than 60 percent of TVA's power now goes for defense needs and it is reasonable to expect that their needs will be increased by more than 20 percent in the next 2 or 3 years. TVA must keep step with our defense requirements—our national defenses must not be weakened.

When we come to the question of TVA's power demands, all concerned agree that there is a shortage of power. On this there is no dispute.

As the majority report indicates, the TVA's power revenues have provided it with sufficient funds for the construction of such additional units as TVA now requires and balances are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets.

The Congress has directed TVA to pay into the Treasury over a 40-year period the total appropriated funds for power purposes. Through 1955, TVA has paid into the Treasury \$127,500,000. Through the current year and 1957, additional payments in the amount of \$134 million will have been made. These payments, together with the payment of \$24 million into the Treasury prior to the enactment of legislation requiring such repayments, makes a total of \$285,500,000, which TVA will have repaid into the Treasury through 1957. This amount is far in excess of the minimum required for annual repayments.

TVA is far ahead of its repayment schedule. It is, therefore, only reasonable and proper that TVA should be permitted to exercise its authority to use its surplus funds after having met its statutory requirements by payments into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed without the repeated criticisms leveled at this great agency.

This bill, I repeat, is an all-American measure and its enactment will go far toward developing our own country and strengthening the defense of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the House Appropriations Committee for including a \$4,000 appropriation to make a preliminary survey of the Trempealeau River in the 1957 public works appropriations bill before us today. The project, Docket No. 566, was approved by the Corps of Engineers on March 10, 1955, and by the House Public Works Committee on July 14, 1955. Unfortunately, this project was not included by the Bu-

reau of the Budget in the 1957 funds for preliminary surveys.

Before discussing the need for flood-prevention control in the Trempealeau River Valley, I want to touch briefly on the importance of speedy action on completing the preliminary survey. County agents in the area and the erosion control agent of the Wisconsin State Soil Conservation Service have been doing a lot of work in organizing watershed along the creeks flowing into the Trempealeau River. The Corps of Engineers have informed me that, in their preliminary survey, they will consider cooperation by local watershed groups. Since the local groups are being organized or are already organized, once the overall survey is completed, work can go ahead under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, on the small creeks.

There is a crying need for this proposed flood-control project in the Trempealeau River Valley. Through the years, flood conditions have caused severe, and in several instances, irreparable damage to farms, communities, and other areas in the Trempealeau Valley.

The Army engineers, in approving the review study, has this to say:

The Trempealeau River, a tributary of the Mississippi River, is located in west central Wisconsin and drains an area of about 630 square miles. The watershed is located in a region that is primarily farming, and includes the communities of Hixton, Taylor, Blair, Whitehall, Independence, Arcadia, and Dodge. The stream has a fall of 330 feet in a distance of 75 miles. There is no existing Federal flood-control project in the basin.

For some time, I have been working with M. W. Torkelson, director of regional planning of the bureau of engineering, State of Wisconsin; Peter Bieri, county agent of Trempealeau County; Antone Chucka, county agent of Jackson County, and with others on compiling damage figures. The Weather Bureau at La Crosse, Wis., in a letter of February 12, 1955, stated that—

On the average there is a frequency of about three damaging floods in the Trempealeau Valley per year. In the year 1954 there were four damaging floods with an estimated total loss of \$438,000.

The dates of these and the damage costs of these disastrous floods are as follows: May 2-5, \$118,000; June 20-24, \$250,000; July 4, \$10,000; October 4, \$60,000.

In addition, I have a detailed report compiled by the Trempealeau County Highway Department listing damages to 47 bridges, 7 culverts and 51 roads, at a total cost of \$218,992 for the 4 floods of 1954.

For the year 1953, there were 3 major floods, in March, July, and August with a total estimated loss of \$35,000. This figure does not include erosion loss which would add greatly to the total figure.

In April 1955, the river again went on a rampage, causing untold damage to homes, business establishments, farmers, livestock, highways, bridges, and railroad and communication lines in the area.

I do not wish to go into a lengthy recital of recent damages, but would

like to outline briefly the major effects of the April floods. Final estimates of total damages are not available, but conservative figures run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

At Blair, the dam was damaged, and flood waters inundated farmlands and commercial establishments. Some residents were evacuated from their homes. When the water main supplying the city with water broke, residents were asked to boil drinking water as a precautionary health measure. Estimated flood damage at Blair amounted to \$35,000.

At Whitehall, another dam broke and the raging waters flooded highways, farmlands, and homes. Telephone service was interrupted and the community was without mail. Estimated flood damage at Whitehall amounted to \$11,000.

Severe flooding of farmlands at Independence caused an estimated flood damage of \$10,000.

At Dodge, livestock had to be moved from the lower lands by boat. Estimated flood damage in this community amounted to \$25,000. Pigeon Falls reported damages amounting to \$7,500.

Arcadia bore the brunt of the flood. In this community, the water was higher than at any time since the disastrous flood of 1919. More than 20 blocks in the business and residential area were under water at the height of the flood and the community was under 3½ feet of water in some spots. The National Guard was called out to assist in sand-bagging operations, but floodwaters broke through in the early hours of April 4. A 400-foot bridge was wiped out and railroad service was halted. Total damage at Arcadia is estimated at \$105,000, according to figures sent me by Peter Bieri, Trempealeau County agent. This is in addition to \$50,000 estimated cost to repair railroad tracks.

The county agent has set a figure of \$10,000 as estimated damage to rural areas along the river in Trempealeau County.

In my home county, Jackson County, the village of Hixton suffered the greatest damage. The village clerk has estimated damage to property owners in the area amounted to almost \$16,000 while farmers in the area reported damages of about \$2,000. The community of York, according to Jackson County Agricultural Agent A. J. Chucka, suffered damages of over \$1,000.

The above figures cannot begin to cover the loss in terms of topsoil; nor can they speak for the misery and heartache suffered by those in the river basin. Observers present on the scene commented: "A complete watershed soil conservation program could have prevented all this."

I am able to cite facts and figures on floods back as far as 1919, when two lumberyards were nearly demolished and thousands of dollars of damage was suffered by homeowners and businessmen in the city of Arcadia. But I believe I have presented enough evidence to show the tragic conditions resulting from the Trempealeau River floods over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the passage of H. R. 11319.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to in general commend the Appropriations Committee for its work on H. R. 11319. They put in many long hours considering the almost countless projects presented and deserve the gratitude of us all. I was disappointed, however, to note that in final form the legislation omits a provision of some \$250,000 for Mathews Canyon Reservoir contained in the budget for fiscal year 1957. This sum was for the purpose of constructing an access road and acquisition of lands at the dam site of what is known as the Mathews Canyon Reservoir in southern Nevada. This reservoir together with Pine Canyon Reservoir comprises an overall plan for flood control for Meadow Valley Wash and its tributaries in southeastern Nevada. Construction of this project would provide protection to many miles of the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, to numerous miles of county roads along narrow canyons, much of the town of Caliente, Nev., and an important national highway going through this region.

Reoccurring floods in the past have caused considerable damage and impeded traffic. At one time, the railroad traffic was interrupted for more than 6 months as a result of flood damage.

I am informed that the Mathews project appropriation was excluded because the principal beneficiary would be the Union Pacific Railroad. This seems to me to be an inadequate excuse for removing this project from the recommendations of the executive branch. It is true that the Union Pacific will benefit, but benefits will, also, flow to the city of Caliente, one whose primary industries for many years has been the railroad passing through this area.

Mr. Chairman, is the town of Caliente to be penalized because one of its major industries is a railroad? Are the floods to be permitted to continue threatening both life and property merely because there is not a greater variety of economic activity in this region? Is the State to be discriminated against merely because a substantial part of the benefits will flow to a transportation system instead of to large industrial or farm areas?

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the committee has erred in omitting this worthwhile project and I am hopeful that this item will be restored as presented by the executive branch when considered by the other body.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Henderson].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a severe disappointment to the people of southeastern Ohio that the public-works appropriations bill does not contain provisions for the resumption of the construction of the Dillon Dam in Ohio. I share this disappointment since I am convinced that this project is sound and



that it is urgently needed if the Muskingum River Valley is to obtain the flood-control benefits it requires and the Ohio Basin is to be spared the devastation wrought in flood periods by the waters of this major tributary.

For many years, the Congress has heard discussions of this worthy project and has already appropriated sums aggregating nearly \$9 million for the construction of this dam. Today, the Dillon Dam stands one-third completed. Flood control, however, cannot be obtained from an uncompleted dam. The uselessness of such a considerable expenditure has been called to the attention of each member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Earlier this year, I wrote to each Member providing copies of a special brochure prepared by the Zanesville (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the McConnellsville and Marietta Chambers of Commerce. This excellent publication outlined the urgency of the flood-control problem in the Muskingum Valley and presented technical and statistical information obtained from the United States Corps of Engineers.

I wish to point out that the Corps of Engineers regards this project as entirely meritorious and necessary for the control of floods in the Muskingum and Ohio River Basins. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, has stated that "Dillon Reservoir is necessary for the adequate control of Muskingum River floods" and the engineers have indicated their belief that the Dillon project is "one of the higher priority ones for completion."

I also wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives that after a careful evaluation of all factors involved, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has endorsed the Dillon project, placing it in its first classification. In taking this action, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stated its conviction that "the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest."

The Dillon Dam also has the support of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. In a recent letter Mr. William J. Hull, chairman of this association's legislative committee stated, "This association has, of course, included the important Dillon Reservoir in its program. While we did not specify in our presentation to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which we believe needed for the Dillon Reservoir in fiscal 1957, we do expect to recommend an appropriation of \$2,500,000 on that project for that fiscal year when we present our program to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees."

Within the past several months, it has been gratifying to me to read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer a series of articles ably and carefully analyzing the technical aspects of the Dillon project, the use to which it would be put, and such arguments as have been advanced against it. Following the publication of this series, the Plain Dealer on Saturday, April 14, published a strong editorial urging the completion of the dam. Sum-

marizing its findings, the newspaper stated, "The public interest, in the largest sense would be served by the completion of Dillon Dam. But whatever the decision, something should be decided and decided now. Further dallying only threatens to make the major investment to date quite useless."

So that there may be no question as to what is involved here, I want to provide a brief statement outlining the background, present status, and future needs of this project.

The Dillon Dam and Reservoir project, authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, provides for the construction of an earth-fill dam on the Licking River 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers at Zanesville, Ohio. Its chief purpose is for urgently needed flood control. The maximum height of the dam will be 118 feet with a top length of 1,350 feet. An uncontrolled concrete-lined spillway will be provided in the left abutment and the outlet works will consist of two gate-controlled conduits near the right abutment. Four dikes will need to be constructed for the reservoir. The project also includes the relocation of 19.5 miles of tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, 12.2 miles of highways, 32.7 miles of powerlines, 17.2 miles of pipelines, and 34.2 miles of telephone and telegraph lines. It also includes the relocation of 360 graves and the acquisition of 15,180 acres of land.

The estimated cost of the entire project is \$28,800,000, of which \$8,825,300, or nearly \$9 million, has been appropriated thus far. No additional funds are required for further planning—all that has been done. The Corps of Engineers has now estimated that it could profitably utilize \$2,600,000 during the first fiscal year in which construction is resumed.

This sum would provide for the construction of track work and appurtenances on the relocated alignment for the railroad. The grading work was all completed prior to suspension of work during the Korean emergency. All preconstruction planning has been completed and contract for the track work could be awarded in August 1956. The recommended funds would also provide for land acquisition and utility and county road relocations, thereby permitting initiation of actual construction of the dam early in the fiscal year 1958. Relocation of State highways could also be initiated in fiscal year 1958 and the entire project could be completed during the fiscal year 1960.

According to information I have received, the funds would be applied as follows:

Continued land acquisition.....	\$190,000
Continued county road relocation.....	30,000
Initiate and complete track work and appurtenances, Baltimore and Ohio RR relocation.....	2,045,000
Continued utility relocations.....	60,000
Engineering and design.....	105,000
Supervision and administration.....	170,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,600,000</b>

This project will serve as an essential supplement to the 14 existing reservoirs in the Muskingum River basin and a

meritorious unit in the system of reservoirs for reduction of floods on the Ohio River. The reservoir will control approximately 29 percent of the presently uncontrolled area above the highly industrialized city of Zanesville, Ohio. It will greatly decrease the hazards of heavy damage from extreme floods that still exist in the Muskingum River Valley. The benefits to be obtained will accrue largely along the Muskingum River below the mouth of the Licking River, including the cities of Zanesville, McConnellsville, and Marietta, Ohio. Zanesville, with a 1950 population of 40,517, has many varied industries and manufacturing plants including iron and steel and products thereof, chemical, and electrical equipment. The area below Zanesville includes two large steam electric plants—Philo, capacity 500,000 kilowatts and Muskingum River, 400,000 kilowatts—and expanding chemical and industrial developments.

In addition, benefits will be provided by the project to the rapidly expanding industrial developments, cities and towns, valuable farmlands, and railroads and highways along the Ohio River from Marietta, Ohio, to Cairo, Ill. A new unit of the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp. was recently completed on the Ohio River bank immediately below Marietta. Large steam electric plants were also recently completed on the Ohio River, at Graham Station, W. Va., about 50 miles below Marietta and at Cheshire, Ohio, to provide power for the Atomic Energy Commission's Portsmouth, Ohio, project. Benefits will also accrue to the project by operation of the conservation pool to provide increased low-water flow during dry periods.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefit-cost ratio to be 1.31 to 1 as of July 1955. The Corps has also estimated the average annual benefit from the project at \$1,570,000 broken down as follows:

Flood control.....	\$1,464,000
Conservation and public use.....	61,500
Water supply and sanitation.....	40,500
Navigation.....	4,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,570,000</b>

However, considering the funds already expended as of no benefit until completion of the project, the cost-benefit ratio on the funds yet needed would be 1.83 to 1.0. Even if we were to consider the entire project as a whole as though no work had already been done, the benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.31 to 1.

There are 104 projects with flood control benefits in the 1957 budget request. For five of them no benefit-to-cost ratio has been determined. However, 70 of the other 99 have a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1.83 to 1, and 30 projects have a ratio of less than 1.31 to 1. Therefore, as it has been pointed out, even if the immeasurable element of human misery is not considered, the Dillon Dam's relative economic benefits still justify its completion.

Additional data has been provided by the Corps of Engineers as follows:

As presently planned, a permanent conservation pool will be maintained at elevation 734 mean sea level, extending up Lick-

ing River 10.3 miles, with a surface area of 1,500 acres. The volume of this conservation pool is 15,000 acre-feet. The net storage of 279,000 acre-feet which is available between the conservation pool and the spillway crest elevation 790 mean sea level, is required for flood control.

Curves showing the frequency of filling of Dillon Reservoir have been prepared and the following tabulation lists pool elevation versus frequency of occurrence for various pool elevations in the reservoir:

Pool elevation, feet, mean sea level:	Frequency years
734-----	Permanent pool
750-----	2
765-----	10
780-----	57

Of the estimated 800 tracts of land required for the project, 131 tracts have been acquired consisting of 3,921 acres acquired in fee, and 531 acres for which flowage easements have been obtained. There remains an estimated 1,730 acres to be acquired in fee and 4,924 acres on which it is contemplated that flowage easements be secured. An estimate made in 1947 indicated that approximately 1,200 people would be displaced as a result of the construction of the dam.

The bridge, superstructure, and railroad steel which was purchased in connection with the relocation work prior to suspension of the project is still in storage. The small steel is stored in a depot in Marietta; the big steel is stored in Zanesville.

In explanation of the part the Dillon Dam will play in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Muskingum Valley, the engineers have furnished the following information:

The communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected to a considerable degree by the 14 existing reservoirs, remain subject to a flood hazard because of the large uncontrolled watershed area and the possibility of a flood on the Licking River. The uncontrolled drainage area above Zanesville, including the 780 square miles of the watershed of the Licking River, is 2,572 square miles, or 37.6 percent of the total area above Zanesville. Although the existing reservoirs are adequate to reduce all but major floods on the Muskingum River below damage stage at the more important communities upstream from the influence of backwater from the Ohio River floods, heavy damage will result from extreme floods until additional protection is provided.

It is estimated that the present average frequency of damaging floods at Zanesville, as modified by the existing reservoirs is equivalent to one occurrence in 10 years and that if the Dillon Reservoir were constructed this frequency could be reduced to one recurrence in 50 years. Should a flood equivalent to that of the maximum of record (March 1913) occur, it is estimated that the crest at Zanesville as modified by the 14 existing reservoirs could be reduced by the operation of the Dillon Reservoir an additional 4 feet, or from a stage of 37.8 feet to 33.8 feet. Flood stage at Zanesville is 28 feet. Flood reductions along the Ohio River would be significant during major floods. During a flood equivalent to that of 1913, the Dillon Reservoir could hold out a peak flow of 32,000 cubic feet per second at the dam site and an average flow of 11,300 cubic feet per second during a period of 3 days before and 3 days after the Ohio River crested at the mouth of the Muskingum River. These estimates of holdout flow are considered conservative, in that they were made on the assumption that a bankfull stage of 7,000 cubic feet per second would be maintained at the proposed Dillon Dam during flood periods.

Since the authorization of the Dillon Dam several floods have occurred which might have been controlled and their damaging effects greatly reduced, had the Dillon Dam been completed. In 1952 such a flood poured into the Muskingum Valley largely from the uncontrolled Licking River. Some persons opposed to the dam have charged that this flood was caused by the faulty or careless operation of such dams as already exist in other parts of the Muskingum watershed area. Gen. E. C. Itschner explained what occurred and what might have been prevented:

The flood on the Muskingum River in January 1952 was caused, not by incorrect operation of the reservoirs in the Muskingum River Basin, but by heavy rainfall on areas not controlled by dams. The areas of the upper Muskingum below the dams and the watershed of the Licking River are completely uncontrolled. The reservoirs were operated so as to produce the greatest possible reduction consistent with the requirement that the corps be prepared for the maximum possible flood. This requirement prevents some storage in the early stages of a flood and limits the reduction of moderate floods, while producing the greatest possible effect on more severe floods. The total runoff stored during the flood of 1952 by the 14-reservoir system amounted to 423,485 acre-feet or approximately 70 percent of the total storm runoff from the controlled drainage area, thereby reducing the flood stage at Zanesville by 2.7 feet. Since the heaviest rainfall occurred on the uncontrolled areas nearest to Zanesville, only limited reduction of the crest stage at Zanesville was possible. The area on the Licking River that would be controlled by Dillon Reservoir was subjected to the heaviest rainfall. Control of this area would have completely prevented any flood at Zanesville and below on the Muskingum River upstream of Ohio River backwater.

Operation of the Muskingum reservoir system was initiated promptly in accordance with standard operation procedure as soon as it became apparent that high stages would prevail at downstream points. The storage of virtually all runoff from the controlled areas indicates that there was no tardiness in effecting operation. A review of the reservoir operations confirms efficient operation.

Certain other questions have arisen which have been fully explained in testimony before the Congress during the past decade. One deals with the suggestion that the flood-control problem in this case might be more effectively dealt with if a series of smaller dams were constructed on streams tributary to the Licking. Such a plan has been fully explored by the Corps of Engineers. This study leads to the conclusion that the plan would require a greater Federal expenditure, would take more land, and dislocate many more families than the single larger dam.

Another issue in the past has raised the fear that if the Dillon Dam were built, the city of Newark, upstream on the Licking River, might be flooded. Dealing with this question, a spokesman for the Corps of Engineers has stated:

That simply is not a fact. The elevation of the river at the approach to this dam was determined by levels, and it was actually determined and even if we assume that at some future date there will be a flood in the Licking River 25 percent in excess of what has ever occurred in the records of the river, the water would still lack something

like one and a half miles of reaching the city of Newark.

Some apprehension has arisen that 10,500 acres of agricultural and other lands might be taken out of farm production as a result of this project. In explanation of the baseless character of this fear, the engineers have provided the following information:

Actually there will be really taken out of cultivation only 1,500 acres. The remainder of the acreage up to the spillway level will be affected only intermittently, and if the experience in the Miami Conservancy District, or in the remaining dams in the Muskingum Conservancy District, is any criteria, only a small percentage of the acreage will be covered. In fact in the 14 reservoirs the United States does not own much of the land within the reservoir area; there is only an easement to flood at certain irregular and unknown periods; and for that easement and for the damage which might result from such floods the proper owner has been paid in the form of an easement agreement; so that the permanent area that is taken out of cultivation is 1,500 and not 10,500.

Another question has charged that the city of Zanesville is anxious that the Dillon Reservoir, created so that it might serve as a source of a municipal water supply. In response to this argument, I wish to quote a letter which I received this morning from Mr. W. A. Keslar, president of the Zanesville City Council. The letter is as follows:

MAY 19, 1956.

HON. JOHN HENDERSON,  
15th District, Ohio,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are aware of my interest in the Dillon project on the Licking River near Zanesville.

At various times in the past certain opponents of this flood-control project have said that Zanesville wanted it for future city water supply.

In order that you may advise any interested parties I want to refer you to the fact that on May 8 the people of Zanesville voted a bond issue for \$2,500,000 in order that we may improve and enlarge our waterworks. The engineering plans call for taking the water from the Muskingum River and not the Licking River so that for the next hundred years demand for water would not require us to use the Licking River.

Many thanks for your continued efforts to secure funds for this much-needed flood control project.

Very truly yours,

W. A. KESLAR,  
President, Zanesville City Council.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some local opposition to this project. I had thought that such opposition as had once existed had greatly declined. However, it has become apparent that, while the opposition has diminished, it has not disappeared. It is, however, a vocal and powerful minority, a situation common to any flood control project.

As a result, the Dillon Dam has been subjected to the closest scrutiny over the years—far closer than that accorded virtually any other project now pending. The disclosure of the full facts in the case has always shown the project to be fully justified and necessary. The arguments against it have been shown to be ill-founded or completely unsupportable in view of the facts in the case. Despite the most careful exposition of the facts on many occasions, one still hears some



of these bankrupt arguments repeated with incredible monotony. If such minority opposition were allowed to deter Federal action, there is grave doubt that any flood control projects would ever be authorized or completed. Proponents of Dillon wish only that the project be considered entirely on the basis of need, the benefits it would bring, and the favorable benefit to cost ratio.

I must state in all respect, that the failure of the Congress to provide the funds needed for the Dillon Dam has caused dismay and consternation to the people of southeastern Ohio. Residents of the Muskingum Valley find it difficult to believe that there is an intention to abandon such a valuable project. I share their consternation. However, I am positive that there is no intention on the part of the Federal Government to turn its back on either the recognition it has already given of the necessity for the project or the \$9 million it has already spent at the Dillon site.

The long delay in resuming construction of the dam which was suspended during the Korean emergency is a source of great and continuing concern to me. In this my feeling is shared by both of our Ohio Senators as well as the Governor of our State. These eminent spokesmen for the people of Ohio have taken strong and unequivocal positions in urging that the Dillon project be completed without further delay.

The Corps of Engineers clearly put the people of the Muskingum Valley on notice that flood control is impossible unless the Dillon Dam is completed. Already this year there have been threats of floods from the uncontrolled Licking River. It is, therefore, not difficult to understand the impatience which the potential flood victims feel, particularly when in the course of normal weather, disaster might strike at any time and particularly when the means for preventing such an occurrence has been so clearly defined and approved many years ago by the Congress.

It is my most earnest hope that the Muskingum Valley will be spared the havoc of floods until the Dillon Dam can be completed and the rampaging waters of the Licking River brought under control. I must state in all sincerity that the responsibility for failure to finish this dam could prove to be a heavy one.

I have received petitions containing the names of thousands of Muskingum Valley residents urging that favorable action be taken in the Congress. Many letters from community leaders have also been received. Some of these letters are as follows:

THE GREINER DAIRY CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you know, much interest has again been shown the Dillon Dam project near Zanesville. You are familiar with all the details. You are also probably familiar with the fact that about 15 years ago some 15 dams were constructed to control the Muskingum River and its tributaries. This has meant much to Zanesville, and we have not had the great floods that threatened our community heretofore. However, after heavy rains, the Licking River still

rampages and causes much damage to Zanesville. For this reason, I urge you to make every effort to have funds allocated to complete this project, which, of course, was started several years ago.

Very truly yours,  
EUGENE C. GREINER, Sr.

DUTRO BROS.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.  
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Dillon Dam. We have been here in business for 11 years and have been washed out 3 times. We feel as though we have paid taxes long enough here—and as the Dillon Dam project already has been started, we feel as though our money has been wasted, it costs a lot of money and hardship on everyone in this locality every time it floods, which doesn't take too much rain. We are threatened again this spring—please help us. Our money we have paid for taxes is being wasted if the project is not finished.

Yours truly,  
DUTRO BROS.

OXFORD OIL CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.  
DEAR SIR: We urge you to support additional appropriations to cover the completion of the Dillon Dam above Zanesville, Ohio.

It seems to us only common sense to protect the investment already made in this project.

Very truly yours,  
J. W. STRAKER, Vice President.

THE UNITED FUND OF ZANESVILLE AND  
MUSKINGUM COUNTY, INC.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.  
DEAR MR. HENDERSON: We in Zanesville as a community are very much interested in seeing enough money appropriated by your Congress to start work again on the Dillon Dam project.

The same principle is certainly involved in this delayed project as applied to all of the other Muskingum conservancy dams, and a great many communities, including Zanesville, will benefit by this work being reactivated.

Having spent most of my 60-plus years in Muskingum County, I feel that this Zanesville protection is a "must" at some early date.

Thanks for your cooperation and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,  
E. ROYAL CRAWMER,  
Executive Director.

MARCH 30, 1956.  
JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking this means to thank you for the support given in reawakening interest in the ultimate completion of the Dillon Dam.

I urge you to continue with your efforts to have funds allocated for the completion of this most vital project.

Very truly yours,  
R. E. EMERY,  
ZANESVILLE, OHIO.

THE ZANESVILLE STONWARE CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.  
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
Old House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Here in Zanesville we are very much concerned over the reluc-

tance of Congress to place in the appropriations bill a reasonable sum for the reactivation of the Dillon Dam flood-control project on the Licking River.

This writer well remembers the disastrous 1913 flood in Zanesville. Although this plant is on high ground and the flood waters of 1913 did not reach it, the company was out of business for over a month following that flood and suffered that year a manufacturing loss. The plant was first open to refugees from the flooded areas and later was the barracks for National Guard troops sent into the area. We don't want anything like that to happen again.

It seems to a businessman unjustifiably wasteful to allow approximately \$8 million of work to be gradually washed away down the Muskingum Valley. In my estimation, if the advice of the Army engineers is accurate, and if there was basis for the approval of the project originally, there is every reason for this Congress to fulfill an obligation of the United States Government to complete this Dillon Dam.

In all progress there is some opposition, but it is the good of the majority which should prevail.

Very truly yours,  
V. B. LINN.

BONIFIELD HARDWARE CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the interest of flood control for the city of Zanesville and the entire Muskingum Valley, I sincerely would appreciate your support in seeing that funds are allocated for the Dillon Dam project as authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1938.

Yours sincerely,  
J. W. BONIFIELD, Jr.

ROYAL CLEANING CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A note to express our interest in future work on Dillon Dam.

We wish to urge you to your best efforts to obtain the proper allocation of funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project.

Sincerely,  
E. E. TALLEY, President.

MUTUAL FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN  
ASSOCIATION OF ZANESVILLE,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We in this community appreciate the sympathetic interest you have so far shown in the completion of the Dillon Dam project. We want to urge upon you that the matter be pressed to a successful conclusion when it comes up shortly for decision.

As designed by the Government engineers when the Muskingum watershed flood-control plan was conceived, location of a dam on the Licking River, to be known as Dillon Dam, was to play not only an integral but a prime role in accomplishment of the area objectives. Failure of the Congress to provide sufficient funds for completion of the Dillon Dam after it had been started was most unfortunate and wasteful of public funds, not only from the standpoint of ensuing erosion but by increase in subsequent cost. And it has resulted in the watershed conservancy project falling short of realizing the full benefit possible and necessary.

So, whatever impetus you can give the promotion of this most worthy enterprise to

a successful conclusion will earn the lasting gratitude of countless people in the Muskingum River Valley.

Very truly yours,

MYRON BUKER,  
Assistant to the President.

THE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK,  
Zanesville, Ohio, May 8, 1956.

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I want you to know that I personally appreciate very greatly your efforts to rejuvenate the Dillon Dam portion of the Muskingum River flood-control project.

As an active businessman in Zanesville, I feel that the \$9 million which have been spent on this project would be a great waste of public funds if it is not continued to the completion of the recommendations of the United States Army engineers, as a control of floodwaters in the Muskingum Watershed. I have been a resident of Zanesville for 25 years and know that there is a definite threat of floods from the Licking River, if Dillon Dam is not completed.

I am thoroughly convinced that the headwaters control is the only reasonable solution to the flood-control program of the United States Government. As a public-works program, this type of conservation of our natural resources will be the most beneficial to the country as a whole.

I sincerely hope for your continued efforts on the Dillon project, and pledge my support to any actions which you take.

Very truly yours,

W. D. MURPHY, President.

BURNHAM CORP.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note that a decision will be reached within the next few weeks regarding the future work on the Dillon Dam. We here in Zanesville are vitally interested in the completion of this project. The writer is vitally interested in the completion of the project, because the last time we had a flood in Zanesville the Licking River caused the writer to move from his residence, lose a week's work, and approximately \$500 damage to his residence.

Let me urge you to exercise every bit of political power you have to see that funds are allocated for the project.

Also, let me suggest that this letter be shown to the eastern panel of Public Works Subcommittee.

Yours very truly,

L. E. SHRIGLEY,  
Manager, Electric Appliance Department.

THE NATIONAL CASH REGISTER CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It's raining today. I noticed the creek running past my place. It is just ready to go over its banks. This creek runs into the Licking River. The Licking River runs into the Muskingum and the Muskingum runs into the Ohio. Now I also note that all the other creeks are as full as mine which means there will be high water again; which means it will get out of control and many a nice property along the Muskingum will be damaged. We had some nice weather early in March and I noticed that when I went down Route 77 most everyone was out renovating their places but now this is all for naught. All because we do not have a Dillon Dam to control this surplus water.

I was reading the other night that the United States Government plans to build

a big dam in Egypt. I for one and many of my friends think it is high time to discontinue this foreign spending and do something at home. Yes, we are believers that charity begins at home.

I was a United States Army Engineer officer in World War I and after the armistice, it was necessary to get a release from various French cities in which and through which our forces had stopped and traveled. We did many unnecessary things such as resurfacing tennis courts, resurfacing bridges over which we had not traveled, renovating cemeteries merely as goodwill builders, but it was my observation we didn't get the goodwill we anticipated and they thought us fools.

I do not care to relive those moments because it stirs up my ulcers but the purpose of this letter is to ask that you put forth your best efforts to secure the necessary funds for the completion of Dillon Dam which is so necessary for the prosperity of this community.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. HEIZMAN, Branch Manager.

LINE MATERIAL CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The work that you are doing on the Dillon Dam project is commendable.

As we all know this has been one of those regrettable jobs on which a large amount of money has been spent with no benefits. Completion of the project would seem to be a logical answer whereby benefits would result.

Certainly completion of the Muskingum flood-control program would be realized. Conservation of water alone would be justification for completion.

May I encourage you to continue your efforts.

Very truly yours,

L. L. BLACK.

WINSOR'S STEAK HOUSE RESTAURANT,  
South Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please do something for the appropriation of funds to complete the Dillon Dam in Zanesville, Ohio, it is understood to help everyone concerned in this part of Ohio State. To help us and our business.

Respectfully yours,

EVANGELOS GEORGE ARGYROPOLIS,  
Manager, Winsor's Steak House, Inc.

THE H. WEBER SONS & Co.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 22, 1956.

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I received the photograph of the group from Zanesville and McConnelville, and I want to thank you for it. It was kind of you to think of me, and I just want to go on record as saying that I personally am very much impressed with the work that you are doing in regard to the Dillon Dam.

It is most inspiring to know that you have made this one of your active interests. I again want to thank you, and when you are in Zanesville I would love to have you drop in and say hello.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. WEBER.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, April 2, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge you to bend every effort toward securing an appropriation

of funds to continue construction on the Dillon Dam project on the Licking River near Zanesville, Ohio.

The money already expended on this project indicates that the merit of the project has been fully realized. It would seem unwise, indeed, to allow the value of the previous expenditures to be dissipated by erosion, thereby increasing greatly the eventual total cost of the project.

The increased public interest in flood control resulting from widespread disasters in 1955 should greatly increase the support you need to get favorable consideration given to this very worthy public improvement.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN H. RUTHERFORD.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
Eastern Panel of Public Works Subcommittee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I am writing to add my opinion to that of others of this district in hoping you will do everything possible to bring about completion of the Dillon Dam. In addition to the factor of flood control, the waste of the several million dollars already spent on the project is hardly defensible.

Very truly,

DONALD A. URBAN, M. D.

SEARS, ROEBUCK & Co.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: It seems sacrilegious not to complete the Dillon Dam project. To invest \$9 million and let it go to waste on an obvious flood-control need is not good judgment businesswise or politically. Please pass any measures necessary to complete it.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. KEEFE, Manager.

THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, April 2, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Dillon Dam project. It would not be sound economics not to continue, considering the expenditures that have already been made on this. This dam is also needed for the protection of the Muskingum Valley inhabitants.

Your continued support of this project will be very much appreciated.

Yours very truly,

E. J. SCHWEITZER.

STARR'S,  
Zanesville, Ohio, April 5, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written to you to urge you to do your part for residents of Muskingum County toward allocating Government funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project. As you must well know, this project has been at a standstill for quite some time, and unless additional funds are appropriated soon, all of the money already spent in this very worthwhile project will have been wasted and the efforts already expended will have been in vain. This project should be completed for many reasons, but particularly in the interest of much needed soil conservation and flood control. Please do all you can for us.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN STEINBERG.



DAVID DAVIES, INC.,  
Zanesville, Ohio, April 3, 1956.

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of David Davies, Inc., and myself I wish to encourage you to favor that funds be allocated to resume work on the Dillon Dam.

Communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected by existing reservoirs to an appreciable degree, today are still subject to great flood hazards as long as the watershed area to be controlled by Dillon Dam poses the ever present possibility of a flood down the Licking and Muskingum Rivers.

R. S. ROBERTS.

I am certain that the justification and value of the Dillon Dam is recognized. I also feel certain that this recognition will be reflected in future appropriations to continue its construction. However, until these funds are made available I shall continue my efforts in behalf of the Dillon Dam, so that it may confer upon southeastern Ohio the flood-control benefits which are so sorely needed there.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise further to inform the House of the importance of several projects included in the bill before us today. They are recommendations for construction by the United States Army Engineers in Tampa Harbor, St. Petersburg Harbor, and the Anclote River. All are in the First District of Florida and all are of great economic importance to the immediate communities affected by this work. I appreciate the long study and the unqualified recommendation of these projects made by the Appropriations Committee of the House and their approval this year of amounts requested of them. I feel certain of their justification in this action. I would further call to your attention several factors that still further qualify such a program as is now being considered by this body.

In the case of the Tampa Harbor project a great new development is now begun. Work, since last year, is well under way with an appropriation of \$977,000, \$477,000 of which was reinstated on my appeal by the House last year. The benefits that will result through the widening and deepening of this channel are already in evidence. One very important feature of the work-progress program has now developed and I would call this to your attention at this time. Certain additional funds beyond the \$2.5 million recommended by the committee which, I am sure, will be recommended by the House today, are now needed for an orderly and economical progress of this work. In the Senate hearings subsequent to those of the House the request for funds was raised to \$4 million. The contemplated overall cost is estimated at \$11 million. I would outline for you the developments that brought this current increase about.

In the preliminary planning of this project first consideration was given to the dredging of the channel and increase of depth from 27-30 feet to 34 feet and

widening to 400 feet from the present 300-foot width a distance of some 50 miles. The United States Army engineers let contracts for the dredging in 1955 and work has been under way in a contracted amount of \$3.1 million. Progress on this portion of the dredging has proceeded at a greater pace than anticipated by the engineers. In a report just made on April 21, 1956, by the Corps of Engineers, and subsequent to both the preparation of the budget and hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House it is now revealed that this contract can and will be completed early in 1957 if the present rate of progress is maintained. The original appropriation of \$977,000 and the earlier budget requested funds of \$2.5 million as reported to the House today will not be sufficient to carry on this reasonable rate of work and the entire project would have to be called to a halt in early 1957 unless additional funds are provided at this time. The truth of the matter is that the work is well ahead of the money. Should present funds be depleted early in 1957 and no work continued until money is available in fiscal 1958 the cost of reactivation of the dredges themselves would be heavily reflected in the bids received which bids are expected to run an additional \$600,000. These substantial savings should not be overlooked in the efficient progress of this project.

Because of the rapid development of the dredging work on these channels that segment known as Egmont and Mullet Key Channels, where work will be done by the United States Army engineers' hopper dredge, should also be gotten under way in 1957. Anticipating 5 months' work in each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 an additional \$625,000 will be needed in fiscal 1957.

Activation of both of these dredging portions of the project at the same time and to thus complete in the year 1958 the Hillsboro channel project will see even more and substantial benefit savings. Figures now available clearly show that with the completion and the use of the Hillsboro-Tampa channel portion of the project as herein proposed \$1.5 million per year will be saved at that time. Therefore the additional amount requested above the earlier request will be fully justified by this additional saving. Estimates of the benefit-cost ratio have now been placed at 3.38 to 1 on this segment of the channel and I feel sure that this is a conservative figure.

I include a chart of these needs and costs justifying this increase for your information at this time.

Fiscal 1956 appropriation for	
Tampa Harbor project.....	\$977,000
Actual expenditures:	
Hopper dredging.....	280,000
Hydraulic dredging.....	785,000
Engineering.....	130,000
Supervision and engineering....	87,000
Total expenditure.....	1,282,000
Advanced by U. S. Army engineers (to permit contract performance) .....	305,000
Total .....	1,282,000

#### Funds required, fiscal 1957:

Repayment of advance by U. S. Army engineers to project....	\$305,000
U. S. Army engineers (supervision and administration).....	174,000
Payment to Standard Dredging Corp. to complete work on \$3.1 million contract covering dredging on cuts A-F Tampa Bay channels (\$785,000 of contract will be completed in 1955-56). Full contract to be completed in early 1957.....	2,315,000

Subtotal .....

Request 1957 budget.....

Additional required.....	294,000
Pro rata portion of second contract and required in early 1957 to permit work on dredging to continue without extra cost of activation and deactivation which would raise this estimated bid. 4 months' work to June 30, 1957.....	600,000
5 months' work by U. S. Army engineers hopper dredge on Egmont and Mullet Key channels. Includes supervision and administration cost.....	625,000

Total additional funds required over budget request of \$2.5 million for 1957 .....

Total recommended as appropriation for 1957.....

NOTE.—These figures are as prepared by the U. S. Army engineers and are consistent with testimony by them before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They include figures not available prior to April 21, 1956.

It is my intent to ask that the Senate Appropriations Committee recommend additional funds above the House figure to be approved today and upon conference on the bill I shall urge this revised figure of \$4 million be approved by the House conferees as well. In such manner the request will be in the interest of the savings that will be realized for both the Government and the public. Any orderly advancement of the day when, through these new harbor facilities, annual savings of a conservatively estimated \$2,230,000 can be brought about certainly should be encouraged. I hope you will act favorably both at this time and at a later date when opportunity will exist to revise upward the amount of the request for Tampa Harbor.

Since 1899 the Anclote River project has served a unique community and important section of the west coast of Florida. The city of Tarpon Springs, only sponge fishing community in the United States, is located some 5.6 miles from the deep water of the gulf. It is situated on the Intracoastal Waterway for which completion plans are well under way.

The channel has been developed under authorizations over a period of years and Federal funds have been expended in the amount of \$244,921 since inception. The Appropriations Committee recommends an expenditure of \$68,000 for deepening of the channel and for a turning basin. This will complete the balance of the projected development which is now 86 percent complete. The

proposal consists of a channel 9 feet in depth and a turning basin adjacent to the wharves.

I urge that the House complete this project of such long standing and provide for this community a channel and turning basin both for the economy and safety factors that now exist as a most justified appropriation.

At St. Petersburg, Fla., the rapid growth of pleasure craft use and the great recent increase of small business population has antiquated the facilities of the harbor. Over a period of years Bayboro Channel and the channel in Salt Creek have filled from silt. Both commercial and pleasure craft have found that the harbor is unsatisfactory for use. In cooperation with the United States Army Engineers, the chamber of commerce, city officials, and many other interested parties I have been successful in reaching satisfactory agreement on the improvements that have been so badly needed. The committee has recommended some \$22,000 for the purpose of clearing and deepening the Bayboro Channel and providing an entrance channel to Salt Creek. I feel their convictions of the necessity of this project have been well developed and I assure you of the great need for this project.

Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk for a long time. I feel that this bill, and most of the other bills that we have considered, have been higher than they should be, but I have recognized that the sentiment seems to be in favor of spending money.

Projects were loaded onto us last year on the floor that will ultimately cost three or four billion dollars. This year the committee started on one set of projects alone that will cost \$1,200,000,000. The committee has started a large number of other projects. Now we have to provide for a certain amount of flood control. We have to provide for real navigation, but we should be very particular to see that none of those projects is approved unless we have absolute evidence that they will serve a good purpose. The more times we provide for more money than is needed, just so many times is it necessary to go back a long way when things go bad.

In this particular case the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers is down by \$26,000. I can remember when they have been cut by a great deal more. The appropriation for construction, general, is down \$953,000. Other appropriations are up. The appropriations for reclamation are down \$31 million. I am hoping that the Congress will have a sense of responsibility as it approaches the reading of this bill. I understand it is going to be read in the next few minutes, and I am hoping that the Congress will not increase the amounts that are provided here, because I believe the committee itself has been fully as liberal as it ought to be right down the line. If we go ahead and put more money into the bill all the way through, we are just

going to create a very difficult situation for the Treasury to meet in the days to come. All of us have got to the point where we feel the pressure of taxation. Taxation has gone up, and personal exemptions have gone down as the result of inflation. That has produced large increases in tax revenues.

The result of all that sort of thing is a very great feeling of unrest. Some people have actually come out and started a drive with very considerable behind them to get rid of the income tax. I do not see how they can get rid of the income tax. On the other hand, it represents the feeling that has been generated by too liberal expenditure on the part of the Government, and I am hopeful that this Congress today and tomorrow if consideration of this bill lasts that long, will exercise its correct judgment in considering any attempt that may be made to raise this bill. I hope that for once this Congress will do a job.

Statements have been made as to the Southwest Power Administration and the Southeast Power Administration. Actually the Southeast Power shows a loss of \$7,919,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates. Southwest Power shows a loss of \$7,570,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, not to exceed \$2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors, and purchase (not to exceed \$11, for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, \$5,357,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations: *Provided*, That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*, That there shall be available for resource development activities pursuant to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, not to exceed \$1,150,000, of which \$400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and \$750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against certain language in the Tennessee Valley Authority paragraph as follows:

First. In lines 8 and 9, the clause "Not to exceed \$2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors."

Second. In lines 11 through 13 "to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations."

Third. Lines 13 to 22, the proviso reading: "That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*."

Fourth. On page 3, lines 1 to 3 "of which \$400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and \$750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all of the language to which I have referred is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the language read by the gentleman is unquestionably legislation on an appropriation bill and I therefore concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] makes a point of order against the language appearing in four different provisions of the paragraph of the pending bill referred to. The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, concedes the point of order.

It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 3, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, further*, That none of the funds provided herein may be used to acquire a building for or as an administrative office of the TVA."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKER) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,270,000, of which \$4,560,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be



used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask of the committee handling the appropriations relative to construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation 2 or 3 questions. I notice on page 6 of the report in reference to the Collbran project that the committee has denied the \$1 million which was included in the budget for the beginning of construction of such project with this statement:

Funds requested for starting this project amounting to \$1 million have been disallowed since the repayment contract has not yet been executed.

I wish to ask some member of the committee whether or not it is their policy and has been their policy to require that contracts be executed before the committee recommends funds for construction of reclamation projects?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; that is the regular procedure of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the budget for fiscal year 1956 and in the appropriation bill for such year, funds were set aside and recommended and approved by the Congress and the bill was signed by the President for the Palo Verde project, the Santa Maria project, the Michaud Flats project, and the Owl Creek project; and, that there were no contracts let or no contracts executed until months after the funds were allowed.

Mr. RABAUT. Those projects were all going on. This is a policy that the committee has adopted because we have had some trouble with some of them in the past and we are now trying to protect the taxpayers.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Collbran project was authorized 4 years ago. The gentleman from Colorado, together with one of the citizens of his district, appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for reclamation appropriations some 2 years ago and recommended that the then budgeted amount of \$1 million be not authorized until a contract had been entered into. The gentleman from Colorado is presently advised that the repayment contract will be signed within the next few months and it undoubtedly will be signed in time that construction can start within the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. RABAUT. When and if it is done we will be very glad to consider it in so much as you have had it in, you can get it in the budget again, and in the supplemental we will be very glad to consider it and take it up. But to anticipate what is going to be done, some sad experiences of the past made the committee feel that in justification to the people who have huge funds invested in these types of projects, there should be a firm commitment on the part of those who are going to get the benefit from the project.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I ask my good friend the gentleman from Michigan this question? If before the other body considers this legislation and makes its final decision the contract should be executed, could the gentleman from Colorado ex-

pect then that this committee and the conference committee might go along with the other body's decision?

Mr. RABAUT. I can only speak for myself, of course, but inasmuch as the committee deleted the project because the repayment contract had not been signed, I see no reason why, if the contract is executed in time for the project to be included in the bill by the other body, that we would not go along.

Mr. ASPINALL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I congratulate the committee upon the position that it takes in wanting to know where the money is going before they make a recommendation. The gentleman from Michigan and his committee know that I have appeared before their committee and have made such suggestions for sound business procedure from time to time.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say to the gentleman that he is a very worthy Representative of his district and the people of his district should be proud to have him as their Representative.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the situation regarding the appropriation for the Collbran project in Colorado. This project was authorized for construction on July 3, 1952. In the budget for 1955, an authorization for \$1 million for this project was included. However, at that time, there was some uncertainty over the project and the necessary repayment contract and I appeared before the committee with James Groves, attorney for the water users, and we advised the committee that the appropriation should wait until the repayment contract was assured.

In the budget for fiscal 1957 the \$1 million appropriation was reinstated. On March 19, I appeared before the committee and again advised of the developments in the area. It was my wish, and the opinion of the local people, that we should keep the committee fully informed. At that time, the actual signing time of the repayment contract was uncertain and my suggestion was that the appropriation be conditional on the signing of the repayment contract, or actually that the construction should not begin prior to the execution of the repayment contract.

When representatives of the Bureau were before the committee in April, testimony was offered to indicate definite progress in the repayment contract and in preparation for actual construction. At that time, the committee was advised that the contract, agreed to as to form, was in Washington for approval by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of Interior and that its actual signing could well take place prior to the end of the present fiscal year and therefore in ample time for the initiation of construction in fiscal 1957.

I was somewhat surprised then to note in the committee report that the funds for Collbran had been disallowed due to the fact that no repayment contract was in hand. The record shows that it is expected to be executed in ample time for work in the fiscal year under consideration, and that being the case, we should not unnecessarily delay this project.

The people involved, including myself, have made every effort to keep the com-

mittee fully advised and we have made no effort to obtain funds in order to start construction of the Collbran project prior to the execution of a repayment contract. We feel now that we are amply justified in requesting that the funds for Collbran be allowed to stand with no more restriction than that no construction be undertaken until the actual signing of the repayment contract has occurred. We have attempted to play fair with the committee and have advised the committee of all developments. It is too bad that this effort at fairness should rise up to strike down the appropriation just when the long effort to get this project underway is about to come into fruition.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on page 6 of the report there is a statement relative to the Helena Valley unit:

Helena Valley unit, Montana: The new funds requested for this project have been disallowed, in view of the fact that there is no repayment contract with either the city of Helena for municipal water supply or with the supplemental water users in the irrigation project area.

That language adds additional conditions to be met before this project can start. The Helena Valley unit was started because of an agreement in the act for Canyon Ferry Dam that land in the area would be put under irrigation using Canyon Ferry water in order to replace some of the irrigated land inundated by Canyon Ferry Reservoir. On the 13th of April in 1954, a meeting of Helena Valley water users and attended by the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation was held in Helena.

More than 17,000 acres of land in Helena Valley was represented. At that time it was agreed that owners of some 4,600 acres who had decreed water rights and who only needed to use water on an auxiliary and supplemental basis would not come into any district to be formed.

The supplemental water users were adamant that they would never participate in any repayment contract except on a sales basis. The Bureau of Reclamation at that time and all times since has known that the supplemental water users would not participate in any repayment contract.

When the irrigation district was formed the district judge who presided over the proceedings made findings in which he said:

That the Bureau of Reclamation expected and thought that after the project was in operation, owners of additional lands not included as a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District, would seek to purchase water from the district and that the plans for construction made allowance for such additional users, but that it was not a necessary part of, or essential to, the feasibility of the project that such contemplated additional users be a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District.

It was never contemplated that these supplemental users could come in on a contract basis or that it would be necessary for them to come in.

When Mr. Dexheimer testified before the Appropriations Committee of the House on May 2, 1955—hearings, part 1,

pages 282-285, 295-297—he discussed the Helena Valley unit. He said:

We have 13,000 acres in the district being formed now.

Mr. Clinton said:

When they started to canvass the landowners to find out how many of them would be willing to come into the new district, the people on the 4,600 acres of supplemental water lands decided that they did not want to come into the district along with the full lands. They preferred to deal with the Bureau separately for their supplemental water.

Yet Mr. Dexheimer at the same time and at the same hearing said:

The next step after the district is formed will be for the Bureau to proceed to negotiate a contract with the Board of Commissioners of that district, and we are anticipating that that step can be completed by August of this year (1955).

When that is done it will permit us to start construction either late August or early September of this year.

Note that Mr. Dexheimer says the Bureau will negotiate a contract with the district and when that is done construction will start.

Later on, in response to a question from Congressman PHILLIPS, Mr. Dexheimer assured him:

We will not start any construction work on that unit until we have an executed and firm repayment contract from the district.

No mention of a contract with supplemental users and, of course, nothing about the city of Helena.

The second part, that there be a contract with the city of Helena, was never a part of the plan.

The Bureau of Reclamation admits that the negotiations with the city of Helena started after "submittal of a definite plan report" of the Helena Valley project and negotiations only started last winter for Helena Valley.

It was estimated that about \$700,000 additional to apply on construction cost would be paid by the owners of the approximately 4,600 acres of irrigable lands outside of the Helena Valley Irrigation district for a supplemental water supply, but this \$700,000 is to be on a voluntary sales basis rather than a repayment contract and the Bureau of Reclamation knew that it was to be that since the first meeting with the Helena Valley water users.

In addition, it was contemplated that the city of Helena may repay with interest as much as \$942,000 of the cost of construction of the Helena Valley unit but the city of Helena came in after the preparation of the original plan and, therefore, is a potential additional market for water above and beyond the market originally contemplated. The interest of the city of Helena, therefore, in this additional water, makes the project even more feasible than the project as originally planned.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course the gentleman is quoting from various sources. We have to meet the rules about the money that is spent by Congress. There is an unobligated carryover balance, as reported on page 6, for this Helena Valley unit in Montana of \$2,250,000. It is

available for the beginning of construction, but they are not going to go ahead and do that construction unless there is an outlet for this water. We have to have some form of commitment. In other words, this project is not going to stand on the basis of its own. They are going to make a commitment for water or they do not need construction.

Mr. METCALF. Let me say to the gentleman that last year your committee wrote into the bill that "no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of the Helena Valley unit until a repayment contract has been executed." At that time it was contemplated that the repayment contract would be executed with the Helena Valley Irrigation District, the main water user. That has been the plan since 1954, with the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Helena Valley water users have complied with the condition imposed last year. This year you come in and add another qualification that not only must there be a contract with the irrigation district but that there be a contract with the city of Helena or supplemental water users, which is changing the rule after the people of the district have organized the district and performed their part of the agreement.

Mr. RABAUT. You have got a contract for about half—

Mr. METCALF. Not half; 13,000 out of 17,000 acres.

Mr. RABAUT. We will be glad to release this money if the water users will make a contract.

Mr. METCALF. I say to the gentleman that we have complied with every qualification and every condition put in last year, and the committee now is coming in and adding additional qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee relative to another phase of the bill. I have been a bit disturbed about certain items not being in the bill. I notice in your report on page 7 "Transmission Division":

Funds amounting to \$5,500,000 which were programmed for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line have been disallowed.

This item was allowed for this purpose by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department and I am wondering whether anyone can shed any light on the real reason why the amount was not included in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will try to answer the gentleman. In the committee, I made the motion to take the money out of the bill for that transmission line.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is not a reason; I know the gentleman made the motion, but I wondered what the real reason was for taking it out.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will give you the reason. That was for a transmission line from that dam—

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For the Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line, from Fort Randall in South Dakota.

Mr. KIRWAN. Into Nebraska. In the 82d Congress in presenting the Interior bill to that Congress I had 7 rollcalls in 1 day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; in 1 day.

Mr. KIRWAN. More rollcalls I believe in 1 day than had ever been had on 1 bill before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does that have to do with this?

Mr. KIRWAN. I will tell you why. On those rollcalls the Members from Nebraska voted against public power in the Northwest; they voted against public power in the Southwest; they voted against it in the Southeast and they voted against it in the Missouri Basin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is enough. It was a political reason. That is the answer I expected. It was a political reason. I cannot yield further to the gentleman unless he can get me more time. Now I will reply to that. On those five rollcalls—

Mr. KIRWAN. No; there were seven.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Every man voted as he had a right to do. I say this is a challenge to every man and woman in this House that if you do not go along with the chairman of the subcommittee and vote as he thinks you ought to vote, then 4 or 5 years later he is going to come along and chastise you because you followed the dictates of your conscience.

And let me say to you, sir, that the Congress was a Democratic Congress. I checked on that when I saw your press release on this subject. One amendment that was offered to cut the Southeast power project was offered by a Democrat from Virginia, and the Democratic Congress agreed with the Members of the Nebraska delegation and went along with them.

The other amendment to cut Southwest power was offered by a Democrat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who is a Member of this body. It cut them from \$3,900,000 to \$3,200,000; and the House did not agree with you, Mr. KIRWAN, they agreed with the Nebraska delegation. A Democratic House went along and did not agree with you.

The other cut was one offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], as I remember, to cut \$2,960,000, and that was agreed to by a Democratic House. Another amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], cut the reclamation fund 5 percent. That hurt Nebraska but I voted as did the Democratic Congress to go along. There was a need for economy.

That was at a time when the Government budget was out of balance \$14 billion and Mr. Truman, after the Congress got through, froze all of these new projects; he did not permit any project to go forward.

Another amendment was on the Bonneville power project. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered an amendment to reduce that from \$67 million to \$62 million; and I remind you that a Democratic chairman and those under your own leadership did not go along with you; they went along with the Republican delegation from Nebraska of which I happen to be the surviving member in the House.



I will say again to you that if it is going to be the purpose of a subcommittee chairman to move to take out of a bill an item which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, approved by the President of the United States, approved by the Interior Department, because some Member of the House 5 years ago happened to vote against him on 5 or 6 votes in 1 day in a Democratic House and the Democratic House voted, as the record shows, as the delegation from Nebraska voted. When he says because you did not vote right 5 years ago we take this item out of the bill today, I say that is purely a political reason and in bad taste.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to reinstate this item.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Nebraska that I have been here for a long time. The gentleman tossed a challenge out to Members of the House here. But in my time I have never pointed the finger of suspicion to anybody or said anything about politics. There is no public power in Ohio. However, Nebraska is 100 percent a public-power State. Nebraska is the only State of the 48 States that has 100 percent public power. There are no private utilities out there. I am for private utilities and I am for public power. They can both work together.

When the Interior bill was on the floor in the Truman administration every one of the items that the gentleman helped to cut out of the bill involved public power, and now he is hollering about it. Those items were all budgeted in the Eighty-second Congress.

Let me read them to you. The Truman administration made certain recommendations. You know, I only happened to be presenting that bill to the House. As I stated, there is no public power in my district or in the State of Ohio.

First, you voted to reduce funds for Southeastern Power Administration. The four Members from Nebraska did that.

On the second rollcall you voted to reduce by \$550,000 the funds for Southeastern Power Administration.

On the third rollcall you voted against the western Missouri project. The four Members from Nebraska voted against the Bonneville Dam operation. You voted to cripple Bonneville Dam with a war going on.

I am reading what the record shows now.

No. 5, you voted against the Bureau of Land Management.

Sixth, you voted to reduce the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of transmission lines. You voted against the construction of transmission lines. You voted to reduce TVA by \$13 million.

As I said, Nebraska is the only 100-percent public-power State in the Union. The United States Government has spent a huge sum of money in delivering this power. We built a transmission line out there for 150 miles in northern Nebraska. We did that for you after

you voted against every State in the Union having public power. Now you come in here and you want to spend a total of \$9 million on Nebraska for another line.

Some 70 years ago when I came to this earth my parents taught me to have a little reciprocity in me, to treat your neighbors kindly. You have been hollering about foreign relations and other things, but I do not know of any State of the 48 States in the Union that would do what Nebraska has done, vote as a unit, right to a man, to cut public power out of every State that had it, yet they have it 100 percent. Do you call that fairness? Anything fair about that?

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell me, did the House that was Democratic at that time go along with the gentleman?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not care about the House. I am not interested in politics, whether there was a Democratic group here in charge or who it was. I am interested in America and in fairness to all the States, not whether the House was Democratic or Republican. I do not care what it was. I only presented the bill to the House at that time and I am telling the gentleman the way Nebraska voted against every State that wanted public power. I do not believe Nebraska should get a Federal appropriation for this transmission line when it has been in opposition to appropriations for public power in its sister States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain facts that should be brought out in this debate relative to the item under consideration. About 5 years ago after the Department of the Interior requested hundreds upon hundreds of miles of transmission lines to be built in many sections of this country, the Democrat controlled subcommittees for the Interior appropriation bill of the House and Senate decided there must be a stop put to many of those requests for transmission facilities. So sort of an unwritten yardstick for the building of Federal transmission lines was established. It is quite simple. We agreed that where private utilities and/or REA and/or municipalities already have adequate power producing and transmission facilities to furnish power and to transmit power to preferred customers and others from hydroelectric dams and would enter into contracts to wheel power from hydroelectric dams to preferred customers and others at reasonable rates, than the Congress was not justified in appropriating tax dollars to build such facilities. Since that time—and the record will prove it—the Congress has appropriated money to build transmission lines just to the closest load centers into the different States where the people could then come and connect onto the substation and get the power. Now, that is why the committee denied this appropriation for the

building of a transmission line into the State of Nebraska from Randall Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota costing over \$9 million. Even though Nebraska were not a 100 percent public power State from which the Federal Treasury receives not one single red penny of tax from power revenues from that State, the committee would still, I am sure, have denied the term which our good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will ask to be reinserted in the bill.

Now, those are the facts. It would make no difference who was asking for it or what Member of the House asked for such a line as the gentleman from Nebraska is asking for. The treatment would be the same by the Committee on Appropriations. We have treated Nebraska as good so far as building transmission lines into that State as we have in many other States of the Union. For instance, 2 years ago I myself was instrumental in appropriating funds to build a short line from Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota to Lawton, Nebr., because the REA's in that area were in great need of electric energy.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$125,900,000, of which \$63,083,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$208,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of fish protective facilities at Savage Rapids Dam, Oreg., to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for lighting the spillway of Grand Coulee Dam and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed, by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 7, line 22, after "Congress," insert "Provided further, That \$5,500,000 shall be programed and remain available until spent for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa because they were not political. I think what he said is correct, but I believe that transmission lines have been built into or to Iowa and into or to Minnesota and into and to other States. This line was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was approved by the Department of the Interior.

Now, as to the merits of my amendment. The 230 kilovolt line is needed to bring electrical power from the Fort Randall Dam, on the Missouri River, to Grand Island, Nebr., which is the load center in central Nebraska. During the summer months, water must be discharged through the dam down the channel of the Missouri River for navigation purposes, and it is only good business, at the same time, to produce power with this water. The navigation time corresponds with the time when this power is urgently needed by Nebraska farmers to operate their irrigation pumps. Nebraska is fortunate in having a great amount of underground water. What we lack in rainfall, and we are seriously lacking there, we could make up substantially by drawing from this tremendous underground reservoir. In recent years, the number of irrigation wells has been increasing at a rate of about 2,000 per year, so that we now have about 15,000 irrigation wells, and as many more farmers have indicated an interest in drilling more wells in coming years. The power that could be carried on this line is desperately needed if we are to continue to grow and to stabilize our agriculture.

Yes, Nebraska is a public power State. All power is sold and distributed by REA's, municipalities, or subdivisions of the State. All our power customers are preference customers. I can take little credit for this method of power distribution. That was a choice made by the voters of my State. They held elections out there years ago, and a great majority voted to have a public ownership system; so, I do not see how it can be within the province of the gentleman from Ohio to comment or to criticize the power structure of my State.

These REA's, and these public bodies that supply the farms and towns of Nebraska desperately need the power from Fort Randall Dam. We have a drought condition to combat, and the best way I know to do it is by making more irrigation possible.

We are not asking for a handout. Funds for the construction of this line would be in the nature of a loan. Every dime would be repaid to the Federal Treasury, and with the benefits that would come through increased and stabilized incomes, greater taxpaying abil-

ity, and a more secure agricultural economy, the return to the Treasury would be actually manifold.

This request I am making in this amendment should be permitted to stand or fall on its merits and strictly on its merits. I ask nothing more, because I am sure that after the House has examined the amendment they will find it is meritorious. But the gentleman from Ohio has not seen fit to permit such action. His action was based on narrow, vindictive, and political grounds.

I am more than a little surprised and shocked at the attitude that has been taken by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He has been quoted quite widely in the press, and if he was quoted accurately, this is the reason why the 230-kilovolt line from Fort Randall to Grand Island, Nebr., was deleted from this appropriation bill, and I quote from press release:

KIRWAN told a reporter that apparently the philosophy of the Nebraska House Members was not to give anything to any other State but to grab everything they could for Nebraska. He said that while representing a public-power State the Nebraskans generally were against public-power projects for other States.

If that's the philosophy of the voters in Nebraska and the men they send to Congress, then I'm going to use every opportunity I have to be against this project they want.

Now, to prove his point he has reached back to 1951 and 1952 and selected 6 or 7 rollcall votes that he interprets as votes against public power by myself and Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, then a Member of this body, and now the junior Senator from Nebraska. There is nothing in any of these votes that would by any reasonable stretch of the imagination permit the gentleman from Ohio to make such an accusation, and I do not intend to let this go unchallenged. I would like at this point to point out the votes that Mr. KIRWAN has irresponsibly charged as being votes against public power:

First. One vote was to strike out \$3.4 million from the Southeastern Power Administration for power lines in the State of Virginia. A Virginia Congressman offered this amendment because they would duplicate existing lines now serving the area. Although the Democrats controlled the Congress, a majority agreed with the Nebraskans and passed the amendment.

Second. Another amendment complained of by Mr. KIRWAN was offered by Congressman HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas. It was to reduce the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration from \$3,925,000 to \$3,775,000. It was not a vote against the Southwestern Power Administration. It was an amendment for a small economy cut in wartime. You must remember that at this time the United States was in the so-called "police action" in Korea, and the budget was running along at a \$14 billion deficit for that fiscal year. Is it Mr. KIRWAN's philosophy that every Member of this Congress must vote every penny requested by the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Southwestern Power Administration, or the International Coop-

eration Administration? Does he mean to say that if I vote for a little common-sense economy in Government, that conclusively proves I am against public power? Here again the majority—Democratic—voted as I did, and against Mr. KIRWAN.

Third. Another amendment was to strike out \$2,936,000 for the western Missouri project for the Southwest Power. This amendment was offered by a Missouri Congressman, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, for the reason that the lines, if built, would duplicate and run parallel to existing lines serving the territory. Again the majority of the Democratic controlled House voted for the cut, just as I did.

Fourth. Mr. KIRWAN next criticizes my vote on an amendment offered by the Congressman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to reduce Bonneville Power Administration funds from \$67,550,000 to \$62,000,000. In thinking back over this vote, I recall that this amendment was also approved by a majority of the House Members, and still the House was controlled by Mr. KIRWAN's party. If this vote is to be construed as a vote against public power, the gentleman from Ohio, who is the astute chairman of the Democratic campaign committee, should certainly begin rewriting his party's policies on public power because so many Democrats went against him again on this one.

Fifth. Next the gentleman complains that the Nebraskans voted to reduce the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management from \$7.7 million to \$6.9 million, or a cut of \$800,000. Again let me remind the gentleman that this reduction was made, that his party was in control of the Congress, and that if he would choose to be fair he would certainly have to admit that this vote was not even remotely connected with public power, private power, or any other kind of power—except possibly a curb on the power of one of the bureaus of Government.

Sixth. The next vote to come under the fire of the gentleman is the one that caused a blanket 5 percent reduction in the total amount for reclamation projects. This motion was made by Mr. TABER, of New York, to reduce the total from \$207,109,000 to \$197,000,000. I again voted with the majority, but in so doing let me remind the gentleman my vote also reduced irrigation project appropriations in Nebraska by the same 5 percent. This again was another attempt to economize during time of war.

Seventh. The seventh vote Mr. KIRWAN has singled out was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], providing that funds should not be used to start new power lines within areas covered by wheeling service contracts. This meant that if there were lines over which the electricity could be carried, the taxpayers should not be required to build new and duplicating lines. Again the majority of the House agreed with the Nebraskans, and disagreed with Mr. KIRWAN.

Now, just a word of caution to my colleagues in this House who have reclamation or power projects that are vital



to their people at home. Your record had better be spotless, it had better be unblemished—and by that I mean that it had better be right down the line with Mr. KIRWAN or he is going to kick you in the teeth.

I would challenge anyone in this body to show me that he has worked any harder for the development of land and water resources than I have, or who has voted any more consistently for power and reclamation developments whenever the opportunity has arisen. In the debate on the Interior appropriation bill on March 27, 1952, I took the floor to make some remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, pages 3066 and 3067. In these remarks I criticized the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress, as well as the bill, because no new power or irrigation starts were provided for. I said this:

I have not always approved of the method and policies of the Department of the Interior relative to irrigation projects, or the building of powerlines, but in this country it seems to me it is imperative that we look after some of our own resources. Electric power makes irrigation feasible.

And again on page 3067 I said:

I repeat, these new irrigation projects plus the electric energy adds new wealth, brings in more business, taxes, and security to our Nation. These resources must be developed to meet the needs of our expanding population.

Now, in this appropriation bill we are now considering, there has been deleted at the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] a request for funds to build power-transmission facilities in my State, admittedly not on the merits of the project, but for purely political and individual reasons. Merely because Mr. KIRWAN said "MILLER hasn't voted like I wanted him to vote in the past." I do not believe I have encountered such an attitude during my 14 years in this House. Let me say just a word or two more about this project: The total cost is approximately \$9 million, and we are asking approximately \$5.5 million of the project cost this year. This \$5.5 million is not a new appropriation, it does not involve new funds. We simply requested authority from the Congress to transfer the funds appropriated last year for the 115-kilovolt line from Fort Randall Dam to Neligh, Nebr., and other Bureau of Reclamation funds previously authorized. The request was in the nature of a transfer, and not an appropriation. The balance would be requested at a later time.

This line was carefully studied by the Bureau of Reclamation last year. It was found to be feasible, its construction was requested by the Department of the Interior, it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and President Eisenhower saw fit to request that it be constructed.

It now appears that the recommendations of the departments and the President himself are being thwarted and blocked by one man, the gentleman from Ohio.

Now, it is true that I have voted "nay" many times in this House, but let me say that I always vote the way my conscience dictates and I always try to vote

the merits of the legislation. I hold no grudge against any Member of this House, and I respect the right of each Member to vote as he sees fit, regardless of whether he may agree or disagree with me. I hope Mr. KIRWAN can explain his action to his colleagues.

Let me remind the gentleman that if I had voted on these matters as Mr. KIRWAN would have me vote, I am quite sure my constituents would have stopped sending me back here to Congress some years ago.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are constrained to insist upon our point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I concede that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes a point of order; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] concedes it and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

For payment to the "Upper Colorado River Basin fund," authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (Public Law 485), \$3,155,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: On page 9, line 4, strike out "\$3,155,000" and insert "\$6 million."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to correct what I think is an inadvertent oversight on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill as it now stands calls for \$3,155,000 for this project. There is much work to be done in the building of roads and electric lines. In one instance the shortest route to the town is 135 miles. I think we should have had the entire amount that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which was \$8 million, but I decided to make it an amount which certainly I could justify and for which I think every Member of this House could vote. I do not believe there is a desire on the part of anyone here to unnecessarily delay progress in the upper Colorado River project.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Recalling the colloquy that took place here a few hours ago between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I think that it is conceded, is it not, that the item for construction of access roads and housing facilities was perhaps overlooked. Certainly the \$6 million would go a long way toward covering that amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They were entirely overlooked; and to the extent their construction was needed on the Glen Canyon unit, \$5 million, and the Flaming Gorge unit, \$1,300,000, and the Navajo Dam came into this, I decided to bring the

amount down to \$6 million. I hope the committee can see its way clear to approve this amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from New Mexico in offering and supporting this amendment. We both know that the full \$8 million, as requested by the President, has been justified in detail to the satisfaction of the Bureau of the Budget. However, the committee obviously has not relied and should not rely upon this. They should and have considered the request on the basis of the record made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the hearings before the subcommittee.

I have studied the record of those hearings pertaining to the justification of expenditures for the upper Colorado River storage project very carefully, as I know has the very able gentleman from New Mexico. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the record made there by the Bureau of Reclamation as to justifications for all of the money requested leaves much to be desired in satisfying the criteria of the committee, as set forth by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a few minutes ago; that is with regard to stating the actual work that is to be done and how much will be needed for the specific types of work in fiscal year 1957. The record does not present a clear-cut justification for each of the various items of the general program. The committee in its report indicates that it has allowed the amount requested for pre-construction work in the aggregate of \$3,155,000.

I think that the bill, the committee report, and the record of the hearings show that the committee has given this very complex appropriation legislation generally fair and careful consideration. Members of the committee have, in most commendable fashion, indicated that in regard to this specific appropriation, some items with regard to funds for construction of housing facilities and access roads were sufficiently justified but were inadvertently overlooked in computing the amount of the appropriation to be recommended. If all of the reasonable inferences from the testimony are considered, the amount of \$6 million proposed by this amendment is, I believe, justified. I sincerely hope that the committee members will agree with that and will accept the amendment. If so, I think that I can fully agree with the members of the committee that the burden is squarely on the Bureau of Reclamation to further specifically justify the additional funds in the hearings before the other body. By letter and by telephone information, the Bureau of Reclamation has presented to me, as I am sure they have to the gentleman from New Mexico, information which would justify a minimum of the full \$8 million requested. But that information was not presented to the committee for their consideration as shown by the hearings. The Bureau can and should furnish with particularity the amount of additional funds over and beyond \$6

million that they will need for construction of additional access roads, camp site facilities, and for construction of the diversion tunnels. If this is done in making their presentation before the committee of the other body, then I believe it has been indicated by at least some members of the House committee, here today, that they would be inclined to look with favor on the granting of such additional funds when the matter was before a conference committee for consideration. I think that this is a very fair approach to the problem. On the basis of the ex parte information I have, I am confident that the Bureau can justify the additional amounts, but the committee is justified, I believe, in expecting them to do just that in the regular order of proceedings before the committee of the other body.

I again urge the adoption of this amendment and express the sincere hope that the members of the committee, in line with the previous very commendable expressions that have been made, will accept the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico to increase the appropriation to \$6 million on the basis of that which can reasonably be justified from the testimony of the Bureau representatives before the House subcommittee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was rather confused, too, until I got a letter this morning from Mr. Dexheimer, who I think is a very able man.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield to me, since my name was brought into this, I am constrained to say that on the basis of \$6 million I would not argue against it, I would be constrained to accept the amendment, because I think more than the \$3,155,000 will be needed if the roads and the proper construction in the way of housing is to be done. I think we might have difficulty, as the gentleman says, in justifying more than the \$6 million, but certainly that can be justified. I would suggest, if the other members of the committee would agree, that on this side of the House we would accept the amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would appreciate that very, very much. I hope that the chairman on this side will see his way clear to accept the amendment. I am addressing myself to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman has reduced this amendment to \$6 million, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. JENSEN. As another member of the committee, I will say, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I feel the \$6 million which the gentleman requests is completely justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, no other reclamation project ever

authorized by Congress has received the study and attention that the upper Colorado River storage project has. Despite well-financed opposition, Congress this year supported President Eisenhower and the Department of the Interior and authorized this multimillion dollar, long-range development of an entire river basin by a vote of 256 to 136.

The administration has requested an initial appropriation of \$8 million for this project. This amount would enable the Bureau of Reclamation to bring its plans for Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams up to bid stage. It would also provide funds for the construction of access roads to the dam sites and for the building of construction camps for Bureau personnel. In short, the requested appropriation would get this project underway.

The House Appropriations Committee has cut this amount by nearly \$5 million. Members of the committee in granting planning funds have recognized the need for this project. But we cannot save water now wasting in the Pacific Ocean with plans. This project contemplates a 25-year development and construction period. It is of prime importance that we begin storing water at the earliest possible date. I commend the Members for their support of this amendment to restore at least \$3 million of the amount cut but by the Appropriations Committee and I want to serve notice that we will continue our fight for all of the funds requested by the President for this project which is so vital to the area and to the Nation as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law No. 520, 71st Cong., approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, \$7,962,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "\$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,122,000."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$160,000 to this particular item. The object is to have a resurvey of the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway. This project was authorized in 1946. It had approval of the Army engineers and the Congress. But in 1951, the Committee on Appropriations through a special subcommittee chairmaned by Mr. Kerr, of North Carolina, made a special investigation of the project. Based on information, which committee members felt to be sound, they found that the project was not at that time economically justified. The committee issued this particular statement in the report as follows:

This project cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-

cost ratio unless economic conditions in the area drastically change.

Mr. Chairman, that was 5 years ago. It is our contention that over that period of 5 years, there has been a drastic change in the economic conditions of that particular area. Through this amendment it is our object to carry out the specific directions of the Committee on Appropriations, that is, to determine whether or not the project is economically sound. This can be done only by a resurvey by the Army engineers. Actually that was about what the Appropriations Committee directed. But we cannot have a resurvey without financing. The amount of money which the Army engineers contend will be required to finance the resurvey is \$160,000. That is what I seek.

I hope the members of the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. It simply carries out the directions which the committee itself ordered 5 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that will provide the sum of \$160,000 to be used for a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Although this proposed waterway was authorized by Congress in 1946, no construction funds have ever been appropriated. After making a study of the proposal, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions issued on September 18, 1951, a report which concluded that the "proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-cost ratio unless economic conditions in the general area of the project undergo a drastic change."

No further efforts were made until this year to obtain funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, although the conclusions reached in the subcommittee's report were contrary to those reached as a result of studies made by the United States Corps of Engineers.

In March of this year, however, I appeared with several of my colleagues before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee to request that they include in the bill now under consideration the necessary funds for a restudy of this project. We made this appearance because we were convinced that "economic conditions in the general area of the project" have undergone the "drastic change" referred to in the report issued by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions.

The growth of industry in the area which would be served by the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and in the two areas which would be connected by it, plus the growth of the waterborne commerce of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River—the two waterways to be connected by the project—indicates that such a change has taken



place in the 4½-year period since the subcommittee made its report.

Since 1951, five integrated chemical plants have been built and put into production on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Mobile and Jackson, Ala. Two multimillion-dollar paper mills are now under construction on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Jackson, Ala., and its confluence with the Warrior River at Demopolis, Ala. The development of new industry and the growth of established industries in the Mobile area and along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans are among the greatest taking place in the entire Southeast.

At the other terminus of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway on the Tennessee River, similar industrial development has been going forward and continues to go forward.

This industrial growth, coupled with the tremendous attraction which the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River have demonstrated for commerce, indicates that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee project is in order.

The movement of commerce on the Tennessee River in 1954 totaled 8,415,769 tons. In the same year, we moved on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans 6,149,064 tons. Only a careful survey will determine what portion of the commerce moving over these two existing waterways would move over a link between them. But from my knowledge of the commerce that has been and is being attracted to the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway in Alabama by the improvements that are now being made on the project, I am confident that some portion, possibly a substantial portion, of the 13½ million tons of the commerce moving over the two waterways we propose to connect would move over the connecting link.

I do not think we have to depend upon the divergence of commerce that now moves over the Mississippi River system as such to find commerce for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Of course, commerce will be diverted for various reasons, but it is my opinion that commerce will also be generated when this project is accomplished. I am not in a position to know what commodities would move over this waterway. Only a careful study will establish this information, but certainly there is a strong demand in Alabama for grains from the midcontinent area of the United States which lend themselves to movement by barges.

There is also a growing demand throughout the entire Southeastern area for petroleum products including petrochemicals. This is true of the area served by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River, and there is every reason to believe the same would be true of the area which would be served by the link between these established waterways. In addition, an abundant coal reserve exists in north and central Alabama, and with the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the coal from this region would become readily available to the areas served by the Tennessee River.

In addition to the economic changes that have taken place in the period following the committee's report of September 1951, time has proved incorrect several assumptions made in this report. As part of its adverse comments, the report suggested that the Corps of Engineers had not included in its cost estimate the rebuilding of three locks and dams which now exist on the lower reaches of the Tombigbee River. The report pointed out that these existing low dams, with their lock chambers of approximately 52 feet by 285 feet, would have to be rebuilt at what the report estimated to be a cost of \$51 million. On March 6, 1956, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved a project report on the proposed Jackson Lock and Dam as a replacement for these three existing locks and dams on the Tombigbee River. The estimated cost of the Jackson Lock and Dam is \$23.6 million. Assuming that the replacement of these three locks and dams should be included as a part of the cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project (and there are good reasons why this should not be done), the 1951 estimate in the subcommittee's report is in error by approximately \$28 million, and this error lowered considerably the committee's estimate of the cost-benefit ratio on the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

In criticizing the estimate made by the Corps of Engineers of benefits to be derived from the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the report contended that hazardous and uneconomical operating conditions exist between the ports of Mobile and New Orleans. While I am not thoroughly familiar with the operating conditions over this section of the intracoastal waterway, I do know that the equipment which is used to move commerce on the Warrior-Tombigbee system in Alabama is also used on the intracoastal waterway between these two ports. It is also true that standard operating equipment from the Mississippi River system moves without difficulty across this intracoastal waterway system. The fact that over 6 million tons of commerce moved between Mobile and New Orleans over the waterway in 1954 is certainly an indication that the operators of barges and towboats transporting the commerce find no unusual difficulties.

Although the appropriations committee states in its report that the request for the inclusion of funds for a resurvey of the Tombigbee and Tennessee Waterway was given serious consideration, action on appropriations for the resurvey was deferred until the next session of Congress.

Those of us who realize the importance of this development are confident that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is thoroughly justified by rapidly changing economic conditions in the Southeastern States. I therefore respectfully urge the Members of this body to approve today, rather than postpone, the small appropriation necessary for this restudy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Abernethy amendment, to provide \$160,000 for a new survey of the economic feasibility of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. I

believe this to be a great project, one that will make America stronger, one that will make America more certain to achieve her economic destiny.

Evidently, the Congress of the United States thought right well of this project at one time, because in 1945 it authorized its construction.

About 1951 an investigating group of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives purported to find that the project was not justified. This investigating group raised a doubt in the minds of many Members of Congress. In justice to them, and in justice to all the people of America, this Abernethy amendment should be adopted so that we can again get a thorough appraisal of this project by the Corps of United States Engineers.

Not only has this project been authorized, but our Government has spent nearly a million dollars for planning the works on the Tombigbee River which crosses Pickens County, Ala., in the district which I have the honor to represent. We should go this step further. The cost is relatively very small. It will be a good investment for building a stronger America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is merely planning money, money for a resurvey, and in view of the fact that the committee has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the resurvey, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I suppose perhaps it is like spitting into a strong gale, but I do feel there should be somewhere we should draw the line in adding additional commitments to this bill today. It is not as if this were an original proposition that we were asked to evaluate to the tune of \$160,000 in order that we might be properly advised as to whether future planning and construction funds should be allotted to this project. This is one of the oldest of the old chestnuts that we have in the multi-billion-dollar backlog of authorized projects that are waiting their turn on the list to get into the appropriation program. I do not know how well some of you who have been here some time will recall this project, but it used to be the pet project of another gentleman from Mississippi who is no longer here. I think most of you will recall the fact, and I think it is a fact, and not being unkind about it at all, that it got to be a kind of laughing stock on the floor of this House. I have a rather strong feeling that if we now pour another \$160,000 into this well-traveled, well-recognized pathway to huge expenditures, perhaps we will be the kind of laughing stock that this project used to be when it was brought up so frequently by a former Member of this House from Mississippi.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that this particular project requires an enormous investigation over miles and miles and that the project, if approved, probably would cost in the neighborhood of three

or four hundred million dollars. Does the gentleman feel that we are in the kind of shape in this country where we can embark upon such a project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think my views have been pretty well expressed both here today with respect to this amendment and I think I have also expressed myself on other occasions in relation to other projects. This is a dream. The Corps of Engineers time and time again has found that it was not a practical dream. I feel that this is one place where we ought to draw the line, and I hope you will reject this amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISHER offers a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Strike out "\$8,122,000" and insert "\$8,172,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 54, noes 86.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 106, noes 87.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the public-works bill before us today contains one item of great interest to many of my constituents in southeastern Oklahoma. It allocates \$15,000 for a new survey looking toward relocation of the previously authorized Hugo Reservoir on the Kiamichi River.

The district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., has assured the Oklahoma Senators and me that \$15,000 will be sufficient to do this resurvey.

The Hugo Reservoir, as originally authorized in 1946, was limited to the single objective of providing flood protection on the Red River below Denison Dam. The State of Oklahoma and the residents of my congressional district opposed the initially authorized project because it did not contain multipurpose features. It made no provision to meet local needs for industrial and municipal water supplies. It would inundate some of the richest farmland in Oklahoma, but it would provide precious little flood control for us.

We do not disagree with the engineers in their view that additional flood-control

measures are essential to protect the Red River. However, we do insist that the reservoir be tailored more to the needs and the demands of the people in the area where it is to be located.

I am deeply grateful that the committee has seen fit to include this relatively small item in the bill it has reported to the House. I trust the engineers will proceed to make the resurvey promptly once the money becomes available.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 15, line 16, after the figure "\$8,122,000", add the following: "\$75,000 for a study of the canalization of the Big Muddy River, Ill., \$50,000 for a study of flood control of Cache River, Ill., and \$25,000 for study of flood control in Harrisonville and Ivy Landing District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the figure which this amendment seeks to change has already been changed and that a second amendment to the same figure is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This amendment provides for an addition following the sum, which does not affect the sum previously adopted. This is in addition to. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would allow \$150,000 for the Army engineers to start two flood-control survey studies in my congressional district amounting to \$75,000 and one navigation study in the amount of \$75,000. A breakdown is as follows: \$75,000 for the canalization of Big Muddy River in southern Illinois from the proposed dam site of the Rend Lake in Franklin County, Ill., to the Mississippi River.

The next item would allow \$50,000 for a survey of the flood control problem existing on the Cache River and tributaries in the extreme tip of southern Illinois.

The third item would provide \$25,000 with which to study an internal drainage problem in the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage District No. 2 in Monroe County, Ill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a map before me, and I would like to show the Members my congressional district in southern Illinois, which is bounded on both sides by two of the greatest navigable streams in the world, the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. There has been very little done to meet the internal drainage problems of the tributaries draining into the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I, of course, will not have time to discuss each of these projects in detail, however, I would like to impress upon you the fact that thousands of acres of good farmland is being inundated due to floods and has been resulting in great losses in property and money. The two flood-control studies would certainly be a step in the right direction in order that we may be able to get to the bottom of this problem with a sound and justifiable solution.

The other remaining item concerning navigation would allow the continuation

of a study of the Big Muddy River with a view toward canalizing that stream.

I have here in front of me a complete story of the 15-county congressional district which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, telling of the economic chaos in the coal fields of southern Illinois. We are trying to get on our feet. We do not want any handouts, but we would like the Federal Government to give us an opportunity to canalize some of these streams so that we will be able to barge this coal and compete with residual oils and other fuels that are displacing these coal mines.

My people are up in arms. They want at least a study made of these problems.

They do not mind me voting for worthy projects all over the United States, but I can tell you, I am not much to look at, but unless I get some money to be spent down in southern Illinois, to study some of these problems you may not be seeing me here next year. I hope all of the Members will go along with me and vote for my amendment. I am asking here only for the small sum of \$150,000. Will you please go along with me? They are good projects. Thanks very much.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] on as frank and straightforward a statement as I have ever heard on the floor of this House. That is one of the reasons I was constrained to rise in support of his amendment.

I have heard this bill which has been brought to the floor of the House today, this public works bill, described as calling for a tremendous sum of money, a great appropriation. Well, there was a time in my life when I would have considered this a tremendous sum of money, but it is only a little less than eight-tenths of a billion dollars. Just the other day I was on the floor of this House and helped pass a bill calling for \$34 billion plus. Perhaps it was needed. It was for national defense.

One of these days we are going to have before us a bill asking us to appropriate \$4.9 billion to give away to folks whom I have never seen and probably never will; to be perfectly frank, folks in whom I have not too much interest. I do not want them to starve or live submarginally, or anything like that. But still I do not like to bankrupt the United States in order to feed them and clothe them, send them implements and tools and build dams for them so that they can irrigate the Sahara Desert and raise long staple cotton to sell in the world market in competition with what we raise.

So I am inclined to support the gentleman's amendment and support this bill. I would have been glad to pass it exactly as it was brought to the House, but if there is anything done to it, I would rather add a little to it than take something away from it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to know here just a little bit the direction in which we are going. Just a moment ago, we adopted an amendment which



related to a project which was specifically referred to in the committee report. The committee report is the responsibility of the majority members of the subcommittee and is signed by the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. It gives reasons why funds for some particular project were not put in the bill. But when it came time for a teller vote, it seems as if there had been a change of heart between the time when they wrote the report, on which Members of the House are supposed to rely in their consideration, and the time for them to express their personal preference as to whether or not the funds should or should not come in. I do not profess to take the responsibility alone for holding this bill in line. That ought to be and is properly the responsibility of the majority party, which brought the bill to the House.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. I am sure the gentleman would not deny me an opportunity to present my case either to the committee or the House? As I have said I was not permitted to attend the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations hearings because as a member of the Committee on Public Works we had under consideration the highway bill, and on that day I could not attend the hearing. There was not a chance offered me on a subsequent date. I do not think the gentleman in his fairness would deny me an opportunity at least to present a worthy project to the House. I do not think it would apply to the statement the gentleman is reading from the record. They were not referring to those projects which they had not had under consideration.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not referring to the amendment which the gentleman offered. I was referring to the previous amendment and the vote on that particular amendment.

I do not profess to take the responsibility of opposing this amendment. If the majority members of the committee will not undertake the responsibility of holding the line on the bill which they reported, that certainly is not my responsibility as a minority member of the committee. I place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs, on the majority members of this subcommittee, to do so.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in order to reply to the gentleman from Illinois. The Corps of Engineers testified to us that they could use the \$150,000 for the drainage work, and we have allowed that. Some of the gentleman's projects are in that category and naturally would be considered. We are not certain that the others are even authorized.

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

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

Mr. GRAY. The \$150,000 to which the gentleman refers is for the Army engineers to use in making studies at

their discretion. I am sure the gentleman is aware that when they send down to the Bureau of the Budget a list of projects that are worthy, that need to be studied, the Bureau of the Budget approves only a small majority of those. The rest of them, of course, go begging. I am hopeful that the Congress will go ahead and earmark the money for these particular studies because I know exactly what is going to happen if I go to the engineers and say, "Will you take care of my particular project?" They will say, "Well, it is worthy, but we have one of a little higher priority." Consequently, no money.

Mr. RABAUT. We have put in all the money they said they could use. They asked for \$150,000 more and we gave them that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The Committee divided; and on a division (the Chairman being in doubt) there were—ayes 93, noes 111.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and Mr. GRAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 111, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disappointed that funds were not included for the Quinnipiac River project in my district in the 1957 public-works appropriations. This project was authorized in House Document 517, 79th Congress, to provide for the deepening of the Quinnipiac River, in view of the increased shipping and economic conditions in the area. Documentation has been clearly provided by various businesses along the river to show that an increased depth to 22 feet would result in greater volume and improved commerce, all of which would accrue to the benefit of the New Haven area residents.

Funds of \$3 million have been appropriated by Congress to deepen the main New Haven Harbor in 1948, 1949, and 1950 as a result of the authorization in House Document 517. Yet the 11-year-old authorization for the Quinnipiac River, which flows into the harbor and is essential for adequate shipping, has had no action. The United States Army Corps of Engineers has shown that 1 year after completion of the main harbor project the benefits were in ratio of 13 to 1, and that the savings were \$1,661,000. Proportionate benefits could be derived from the completion of the Quinnipiac River project. Fill from dredging the river could have been used very conveniently in the construction of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway through the State of Connecticut. In addition, fill would have been used in adjacent swamp areas, thereby developing the land for industry and other useful purposes

through which the city would derive great potential tax benefits and enjoy increased employment.

Every year of delay in the completion of this project involves considerably more money. In 1945, the original project was authorized at a cost of \$262,000 and has risen in the past 11 years to \$512,000. Besides, records show that the tonnage in the main harbor and the Quinnipiac River has increased from 430,000 tons in 1945 to 946,141 tons today.

New England, and specifically Connecticut, has been greatly discouraged by the seeming lack of interest shown by the appropriations committees, now and in the past, in the need for river and harbor development and beach erosion control in our States. As evidenced by the recent committee report, Connecticut has had but one project recommended for construction this year, amounting to a mere \$1 million. This is out of a total of \$421,734,000 recommended for general construction in the public works appropriations for 1957.

Since 1952, when I was elected to Congress, I have worked arduously with my colleagues from the State and those in my district who are intensely interested in projects such as the Quinnipiac River. The results of these efforts are indeed frustrating and while I am aware of the fact that Congress is perennially faced with lack of funds in this category, I think serious and favorable consideration should have been given to this most worthy authorized project in the Quinnipiac River. For myself, I can say that my efforts will not cease nor, do I believe, will those who have been striving for the same objectives.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed \$1,400,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, \$421,734,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation; or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recognized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction, operation, or maintenance of The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash., and Oreg., and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2 million of the funds provided herein shall be available for the construction of small authorized projects selected by the Secretary of the Army the cost of which is not in excess of \$150,000 and any such proj-

ect shall be completed within the funds herein appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 16, line 4, strike out "\$421,734,000" and insert "\$422,734,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the additional \$1 million which would be provided by this amendment of the amount at line 4 on page 16 of the pending bill would furnish sufficient funds for the completion of the plans and the first year's construction of what is known as Davenport Center Dam, a proposed authorized flood-control dam in New York State which is needed for the protection of the Triple Cities area of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City. As the New York member of the majority of the House Committee on Appropriations it becomes my duty to offer this important amendment.

The Triple Cities area of New York State—I have in my hand a Corps of Engineers map—is represented here in the House by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who favors and will support this requested appropriation.

The area which would provide the reservoir for Davenport Center Dam is located in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]. In the vicinity is the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], in Otsego County, and the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in Chenango County. You will see from the map that Chenango County is quite a distance away from Davenport Center.

The granting of this appropriation would affect the property rights of the owners of 49 properties in their entirety, and 59 pieces of property would be partially affected.

The status of the project at the moment is this: The plans have been 92 percent completed, and the allowance of this \$1 million would supply the money needed for the completion of the remaining 8 percent of the plans and the first year's construction.

In this area there were 7 flood control dams originally authorized by law, 2 of which have been built. The Davenport Center Dam is one of the 5 remaining. These dams were authorized as a result of the loss of 35 lives and \$70 million property damage from floods in the year 1936. Every year we have the same thing happen in this area, recurrent damaging floods, even as recently as March and April of this present year.

The allowance of this appropriation would not only help to protect the cities of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City from floods—and I want to tell you very frankly there is in this bill previously approved by the committee \$1,030,000 for construction of levees to help protect these cities, but it would also help to protect communities downstream on the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania and on into Maryland where the Susquehanna meets the Chesapeake.

Who is in favor of this requested appropriation? Not only is the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COLE], who represents the Triple Cities

area which has a population of 200,000 people, but we also find among its proponents the mayor of the city of Binghamton; the State senator from that area, Mr. Warren M. Andersen; the president of the well-known Endicott-Johnson Corp. which manufactures shoes; the director of public relations of the International Business Machines Corp.; Assemblyman Black of the New York State lower house and chairman of the New York State Flood Control Commission. We also find the president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce vigorously in favor of it. I think it is fair to say that everybody in the area of the Triple Cities is vitally interested in the completion of these plans, which, as I said a while ago, are now 92 percent completed and in commencement of the first year's construction of this very, very important flood control dam.

In opposition we find some owners of farmlands. I repeat there are 49 pieces of property to be affected in their entirety and 59 partially affected. The entire area affected is only 1,800 acres. Thirty acres of these 1,800 acres involve residential, commercial, school and church property, the remainder being rural.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CANNON) Mr. ROONEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in the past century there have been 16 major floods in this area. In the month of August last year if the Hurricane Diane had just swished her tail a degree or two you would have had the same holocaust in the Triple Cities area of south central New York, a very, very important industrial community, that occurred in the Connecticut Valley.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as this vitally affects a populous area of 200,000 people, the amendment should be agreed to. Of course, in every event where land is to be taken for flood control reservoirs, somebody has to kick; but in this instance only 49 pieces of property are directly affected and about some 47 or 48 partially affected. It is in the interest of good government to protect an industrial area such as the Triple Cities containing important defense production plants such as those I mentioned a while ago.

It would seem that as the result of the protests of these few farm owners this matter has been delayed to the extent that it is becoming dangerous. Mr. Chairman, I ask favorable consideration of the proposed amendment which would add, and I repeat again for the sake of emphasis, but \$1 million to this bill to complete plans already 92 percent completed and to start the first year's construction of Davenport Centre Dam.

The following testimony was presented last May 8 to the House Committee on Appropriations by the distinguished Governor of the State of New York:

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1956.

FLOOD CONTROL IN BINGHAMTON, N. Y., AREA  
STATEMENT OF HON. AVERELL HARRIMAN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY, to take the chair.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed honored to be given the opportunity to preside during the course of the reception of this testimony. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as well as to all the members of the subcommittee.

We are indeed honored to have with us this morning the great Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who wishes to address the committee with regard to a matter which concerns the people of the State of New York.

Governor Harriman, we are pleased to have you with us and now look forward to what you have to say.

Governor HARRIMAN. I want to express my appreciation to Chairman CANNON and to the members of the Committee on Appropriations for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee of the United States House of Representatives. I appreciate the courtesy you have extended me in arranging this special meeting in order that I might testify on a matter which you have already considered at an earlier date.

I have come here because the issues under consideration are of vital importance to the south central part of New York State, and in an important way to the State as a whole. It is worth noting also that areas of Pennsylvania downstream along the Susquehanna River will benefit materially from the appropriations I am requesting.

Here with me today are a number of distinguished citizens of Broome County who are members of the flood protection council, and some of whom represent industries exposed to the risk of severe flood damage:

Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of Binghamton;

State Senator Warren M. Anderson;  
Mr. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president of the Endicott-Johnson Corp.;

Mr. Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.;

Assemblyman Jerry Black, chairman, State flood-control commission;

Horace Evans, director of the State flood-control commission;

George E. Knowlton, Jr., chairman, public relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

Mr. Howard E. Orton, division manager of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp.;

Mr. John Bruner, secretary-treasurer of the Endicott Lumber & Box Co.;

Mr. Edgar E. Severson, secretary-treasurer of the Binghamton Container Co.; and president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce;

Mr. Heath D. Andrews, staff executive of the chamber of commerce;

Mr. George G. Coughlin, chairman of the flood protection council; and

Commissioner John F. Donnelly of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, and chairman of the Democratic Committee of Broome County.

I can say I speak for them as well as myself, and they have submitted briefs to the committee on the matter before you.

*Flood damage to Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott*

The Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott has a population of 200,000. It is one of the industrial centers of the northeastern United States. It possesses an unusual combination of skilled workmen and creative management.

Its products are vital to our Nation's prosperity and, particularly, to our national defense.

It is a correspondingly alarming fact that these cities have suffered recurrent flood damage that has reached disaster proportions and may in the future suffer even greater damage unless vigorous and immediate preventive action is taken.



The Susquehanna River and its tributary, the Chenango, meet at the center of the city of Binghamton. Johnson City adjoins Binghamton on the downstream side, and Endicott is located a short way down from there. They are thus doubly exposed to flood conditions.

Along the course of these streams and in low-lying areas are many industrial plants, large and small, and thousands of homes.

Sixteen major floods have, in fact, occurred during this century alone. In July 1935, and again in March 1936, catastrophic floods took place with a heavy loss of life and with direct property losses of over \$70 million.

I understand at that time it was nearly 25 percent of the assessed valuation of the area affected.

#### *History of flood-control measures*

Following the 1935 flood, and again in 1936, Senator LEHMAN, then our governor, was most active in pressing for flood-control measures. In July 1936, he wrote to President Roosevelt urging the Federal Government to move ahead rapidly on the program which the Corps of Engineers was planning for the southern tier. He said that this program "if successfully carried forward will be of the greatest possible benefit to the southern tier counties and, as a matter of fact, to the States a whole."

Following the 1935 flood, Congress authorized the construction of seven dams upstream from Binghamton. Of these, two have been completed—at Whitney Point on the Otsego River in Broome County and at East Sidney on the Ouleout Creek in Delaware County. None of the remaining five has been built, or even wholly designed.

Last summer's floods brought home to us once again the folly of efforts to economize at the expense of effective flood control measures. Aside from the human factors involved, these dams pay for themselves with surprising speed. Whitney Point (completed in 1942) has already prevented more damage than it cost, according to Corps of Engineers estimates.

I hardly need to detail to this committee the devastation—to business, to homes, to farms—that occurred in some areas in 1955. The point I want to make is that it was sheer chance that it did not happen in Broome County.

If Hurricane Diane had switched her tail a degree or two on her course last August and not taken a right-angle turn before Philadelphia, we would have had 1935-36 or worse all over again.

This close brush with disaster, and the terrible reality of the havoc wrought in Connecticut and other neighboring States, have pointed up to all of us in New York the critical importance of flood-protection measures.

This year, in March and April, heavy rains in the Susquehanna and Chenango drainage basins caused considerable flood damage in low-lying areas below Binghamton. The damage would have been more severe if the gates at Whitney Point and East Sidney had not been closed. But it would have been reduced had the Davenport Center Dam or any of the other projects been completed. Such flood damage occurs in this area almost every year.

We have already suffered much; we have been warned of even more.

We feel there can no longer be any excuse for further delay. The fact that we have been lucky so far should not blind us to the risks we have taken or the disasters which may yet occur before the program is completed.

You will understand, therefore, the degree of our disappointment when we learned that the President's budget for the civil works program for the Department of the Army for

the fiscal year 1957 did not recommend the appropriation of funds for any of the uncompleted dams.

I assume that the omission was either an oversight or stemmed from a lack of understanding of the importance of this flood control program to south central New York and parts of Pennsylvania.

In fact, all the way down the Susquehanna River which runs over 400 miles these flood-control dams which I speak of will be of assistance right straight down to where the Susquehanna hits the Chesapeake.

#### *Davenport Center Dam*

The United States Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Flood Control Commission have assigned the highest priority to the dam at Davenport Center on Charlotte Creek, a Susquehanna tributary in Delaware County, for which plans are 92 percent complete.

Accordingly, this year we are asking particularly for an appropriation of \$1 million for the completion of these plans and the first year's construction. The total cost of this dam is estimated at \$12,100,000. It will have a reservoir capacity of 52,500 acre-feet, and will reduce the flood discharge of the Susquehanna at Binghamton by more than 7 percent above the Chenango confluence, and by 4 percent below the Chenango. At flood stage such margins can, and often do, spell the difference between safety and disaster.

In addition to the Tri-City area, the Davenport Center Dam will benefit Owego in Tioga County and a number of communities above Binghamton, including Oneonta, Unadilla, Sidney, Bainbridge, Afton, Wellsbridge, Otego, and Conklin-Kirkwood, and also a number of areas in Pennsylvania, both above and below Binghamton.

The remaining 4 dams of the approved program are estimated to cost about \$43 million. In order of priority, they are Genegantslet on the stream of that name in Chenango County, West Oneonta on Otego Creek in Otsego County, South Plymouth on the Canasawacta in Chenango County, and Copes Corners on Butternut Creek in Otsego County. Eventually these dams should all be built to provide adequate protection both above and below Binghamton, but we are not pressing for construction funds this year as the plans are not sufficiently advanced. I am, however, asking for an appropriation of \$468,000 for additional planning on these 4 dams.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, our requests are indeed modest in light of the dangers that confront our industries and homeowners in south central New York.

In making these requests, I have tried to take account of the problems you face in the total Federal budget and in balancing our needs against the demands of other areas.

Knowing of the pressure of time that is upon the committee, I will not outline the specifics of the products for which we are seeking appropriations. The briefs filed by the State Flood Control Commission and the Broome County Flood Protection Council set forth the details.

Again may I express my appreciation to the committee for its courtesy to me in setting this special hearing.

Mr. ROONEY. In behalf of the committee, may I express our thanks to you for a highly interesting and informative statement.

Are there any questions?

Mr. JENSEN. Governor, what does the local participation amount to? What do the local people intend to put up in the way of contribution to the costs?

Governor HARRIMAN. It is entirely a Federal project in accordance with the programs that the Federal Government has assumed in other flood-control measures. The State, as I understand it, purchases the land sub-

ject to repayment by the projects when they are approved.

To specifically answer your question, this is entirely part of the flood control program as developed in accordance with congressional legislation and plans developed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. Then it is 100 percent flood control?

Governor HARRIMAN. One hundred percent Federal. I may say, and I think I am right in saying this, the Susquehanna River runs over 400 miles, rising in Pennsylvania, coming into New York State, again going into Pennsylvania and down south into Chesapeake Bay, and all those living on the Susquehanna River will benefit from this project, although the immediate urgent need is for this important industrial area.

I might state to this committee that there is in the budget, which I hope the committee will approve, the sum of \$1,030,000 for additional walls and levees along the river below Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson, and the small community of Vestal which will help control the flood waters. The amount is \$1,030,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you know whether or not the Army engineers made a request of the Bureau of the Budget for any funds for any of these projects?

Governor HARRIMAN. I think these requests have been up before the Bureau of the Budget, but I don't know exactly concerning the presentation made to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EVANS. At one time \$100,000 was added to the bill for this but later was lost in conference.

Mr. JENSEN. So you do not know what went on between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget?

Governor HARRIMAN. I am not familiar with that. I do know that all these dams are on the program of the Corps of Engineers. The total program for the State as originally outlined was over \$90 million, of which about half has been completed, 2 in this part of the State and 2 in another part of the State.

The program was developed at the time of the floods in 1935-36. Twenty years have gone by, and much damage has been suffered by these communities.

As you well know, sir, the urgency of flood control comes just after there has been terrible damage, and then we are apt to forget about it.

We had this very close shave this year, with considerable damage in spite of what has been done, so I feel that this 20-year-old concept should now be carried out before it is too late.

May I say that as I understand it, requests to the Budget are usually kept confidential, so I cannot inform you as to what happened there. There is no doubt as to the position of the Corps of Engineers on these projects. They have been approved, authorized by the Congress back in 1936, some of them, and I think two were added at a subsequent date.

Mr. JENSEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you very much, Governor Harriman.

Governor HARRIMAN. There is a small amount of local objection. I have had a few letters on this. Local farmers in the communities affected, as always, whether it is a road or flood control, object to it. However, the main body, as I get the situation and know the situation, of the people living in this area are strongly in favor of this project.

We have had a few letters from particular farmers there. There are 49 pieces of property entirely affected by this in these 1,800 acres, and about 59 are partially affected.

I mention this only in case some of you get a few letters suggesting that this appropriation be postponed.

Mr. KIRWAN. As you stated, the length of the Susquehanna is 400-and-some miles? Governor HARRIMAN. That is right.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can follow the river all the way down to Chesapeake Bay. They have built or are now building levees at many points all along that river. They have them all through Wilkes-Barre and down through that area.

We have apparently not learned much from the Mississippi. On the Mississippi we built levees for years and years instead of building dams at the headwaters. Now they realize the importance of upstream control. They have been building dams in recent years all along the tributaries of the Mississippi.

If they would build more dams like you are proposing they would make some of these levees unnecessary and it would be a much better means of protecting these cities and communities and the whole area, including farmlands, roads, and so forth. Is that not correct?

Governor HARRIMAN. Mr. KIRWAN, as I understand it, these levees are probably wise in themselves, but none of them are sufficient unless we combine them with the flood-control dams. The work asked for in the \$1,030,000 I mentioned is to build levees in the area below Binghamton. It will keep normal flood water in the channels and it will increase the flow, for instance, from 42,000 cubic feet per second to 75,000 cubic feet in the Chenango and 80,000 cubic feet in the Susquehanna River. But that is not enough.

Mr. KIRWAN. The levees are not enough to stop the floods?

Governor HARRIMAN. They are enough to check a small flood but not a big one.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the dams will?

Governor HARRIMAN. Combined with the others they will.

Mr. KIRWAN. Combined with the levees they will check the floods at these cities and towns but the dams will offer some degree of protection all the way down the river.

Governor HARRIMAN. The two combined have been worked out by the Corps of Engineers.

I cannot speak as to the area below here, whether the dikes would be necessary, or the levees, if we complete all these dams. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen who by their presence have come with me to indicate their interest in this proposal would like to have the privilege of submitting supplemental briefs in addition to those already submitted. May that be done?

Mr. ROONEY. Such supplemental briefs may be inserted at this point in the record. (The information referred to follows:)

"A BRIEF FROM THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"(Communications with respect to this brief may be addressed to George G. Coughlin, acting chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.; Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.)

"I. LOCAL PROTECTION FOR ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY, AND VESTAL

"It is to be assumed the Appropriations Committee will recommend that the first phase of the construction of dikes, levees, and pumping stations for local protection for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal will go forward as recommended by the Director of the Budget. If this is not so, or if there is any doubt as to this project being recommended by the committee, then we would like an opportunity at a proper time and

place to present facts showing the urgent need for such construction to protect the important industrial communities of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.

#### "II. ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

"The group appearing before the committee today represents the Broome County Flood Protection Council, which is a unit of the chambers of commerce of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott in Broome County, consisting of representatives of those chambers of commerce, mayors of the city of Binghamton, villages of Johnson City and Endicott, representatives of the governmental bodies of rural communities bordering on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers, the Broome County Planning Board, the Upper Susquehanna Watershed Association, and other agencies vitally concerned with the problem of flood protection in the southern tier. Present at today's hearing are Mr. Charles F. Johnson, president of Endicott-Johnson Corp., Mr. Arthur L. Becker, general manager of International Business Machines Corp. plant at Endicott, N. Y., Mr. Robert Ford, chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of the city of Binghamton, Mr. Raymond Fairbrother, acting mayor of the village of Endicott, Mr. Heath D. Andrews, secretary of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and member of the managerial staff of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Howard E. Orton, chairman of the governmental relations committee of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and manager of the Binghamton district of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp., and George G. Coughlin, who appears in a dual capacity as chairman of the flood-protection committee of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and acting chairman of the Broome County Flood Protection Council.

#### "III. COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

"In Broome County are Binghamton, Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, the largest industrial communities in the State of New York, directly affected by the five dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers authorized by Congress in 1936 and 1944, moneys for the construction of which have not been appropriated. The approximate population of the area to be benefited by the construction of the 5 retention dams is 200,000.

#### "IV. VITAL INDUSTRIES

"Three great industries are directly represented here today; two of them by resident managers, International Business Machines Corp. by Mr. Becker, New York State Electric & Gas Corp. by Mr. Orton, and the other, Endicott-Johnson Corp. by Mr. Charles F. Johnson, its president. It is not casual interest in the problem which brings these men here today. They are vitally interested in the welfare of upward to 50,000 area workers in the plants and in the protection of the plant properties themselves.

#### "V. LOSSES

"In the 1935 Susquehanna River flood, 35 lives were lost. In the 1935 and 1936 floods on the Susquehanna, direct property losses were estimated at over \$7 million. In 1936 Congress authorized the building of the Davenport Center Reservoir, the West Oneonta Reservoir, and the Copes Corner Reservoir, on the Susquehanna River. In 1944 Congress authorized the building of the South Plymouth Reservoir and the Genegantslet Reservoir, but these projects were held up presumably due to the war. We are reliably informed that the 5 reservoirs, 3 on the Susquehanna and 2 on the Chenango, are the only reservoirs in the State of New York authorized by Congress but not completed.

#### "VI. ADDITIONAL PROTECTION REQUIRED

"We do have flood walls and dykes in Binghamton alone, but these are only part of the program. We need upstream reservoirs for the Army engineers tell us that an increase in protection at Binghamton is necessary since the protective works there would be overtopped by a recurrence of the July 1935 storm transposed eastward in the basin.

#### "VII. URGENT NEED

"The torrential rains associated with Hurricane Diane pointed up the need for additional flood protection not only for southern New York, eastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey, but also for southeastern New York. It is true that the sections worst hit by the floods caused by Hurricane Diane were in New England, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but a study of the data submitted by the United States Weather Bureau indicates that the course of Diane was headed northward past Raleigh, N. C., and west of Washington, D. C., and when it reached the point opposite Philadelphia it took almost a right angle turn and headed for Long Island and New England. An inspection of the Weather Bureau's map showing the total storm precipitation during the period from August 17, to August 20, 1955, indicates that if Diane had continued its course northward or veered slightly to the west, Broome County, N. Y., would have been one of the worst victims of the storm. We were just plain lucky.

#### "VIII. LOCAL RELIANCE

"We submit that the dams already authorized by Congress should be constructed before new dams are authorized. People in a community are entitled to rely on the authorization and approval of dams by Congress. The five dams in question should be beyond the controversial stage. They have already been approved by Congress. All that is needed is the appropriation by Congress to carry out its good faith commitment. Two examples of the reliance by the people in Binghamton on the commitment of Congress are to be found in: (1) the plans for erection of a \$4 million hotel by the Sheraton Hotel Corp. The hotel is to be built in an area unprotected by walls and dykes. Sufficient protection, however, would be afforded by the building of the authorized dams; (2) a large shopping center is being constructed between Johnson City and Endicott in an area which could be inundated by a flood of the 1935 proportion. The authorized dams would help protect that area.

#### "IX. COST

"Latest estimate for construction costs of the 5 dams is \$47,665,000. The building of these dams authorized in 1936 and 1944 is long overdue. We respectfully submit that considering the fact that New York State pays over 18 percent of the tax burden of the Nation, it is not unreasonable to ask for an appropriation of \$47 million for the 5 dams.

"There should be no compromise with the proposition that dams already authorized should be built before new dams are authorized. There is no justification for piecemeal construction. It should be noted, however, that the Army engineers are talking about redesigning the dam at Copes Corner on the Susquehanna. If any one project should not be acted upon this year it probably would be the Copes Corner project. However, we believe the construction of the remaining 4 dams should be authorized this year. That would give 2 on the Susquehanna, the Davenport Center and the West Oneonta Dams, and 2 on the Chenango, the Genegantslet and the South Plymouth Dams.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL."



"IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"SUPPLEMENTARY BRIEF OF BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL

"The following representatives will appear before the committee in Washington on March 8, 1956:

"Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor, city of Binghamton, N. Y.

"Senator Warren M. Anderson, State senator, 47th District, New York State.

"Edgar E. Severson, president, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce.

"John Brunner, vice president, Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce, and vice chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president, Endicott Johnson Corp.

"Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.

"John Donnelly, deputy commissioner of motor vehicles, State of New York.

"George G. Coughlin, chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Heath D. Andrews, staff executive, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and secretary treasurer, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"INTRODUCTION

"On March 28, 1956, we filed a brief urging appropriations to construct the five retention dams authorized in 1936 and 1944.

"Because inclement weather prevented the airplane flights from New York State to Washington, we were unable to appear before your committee at the scheduled hearing on March 28. Thereafter, we requested another opportunity to be heard.

"Today Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York State, appears before your honorable committee in support of our request that appropriations be made to further the work on the construction.

"I. NEW INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS

"Under date of April 20, 1956, the undersigned council received the following information from Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Army Engineers for Civil Works:

"Based on the status of planning for these projects the following amounts could be economically used during the fiscal year when funds may next be appropriated for these projects: \$1 million to complete planning and initiate first year construction on Davenport Center Dam; \$168,000 for continuing the next year of planning on Genegantslet Dam; and \$100,000 for similar planning of each of the South Plymouth, West Oneonta and Copes Corners Dams. The status of planning on these projects would preclude use of the larger construction funds you suggest."

"We, therefore, request that your committee recommend to the Congress the appropriations for the coming fiscal year of the following sums for the five uncompleted retention dams on the Susquehanna watershed:

"Davenport Center Dam to complete planning and initiate first year construction—\$1 million.

"Genegantslet Dam for continuing the next year of planning, \$168,000.

"South Plymouth Dam for continuing the next year of planning, \$100,000.

"West Oneonta Dam for continuing the next year of planning, \$100,000.

"Copes Corners Dam for continuing the next year of planning, \$100,000.

"II. ADDITIONAL COMMUNITIES HEARD FROM

"As pointed out in the brief filed on March 28, the undersigned council represents the largest industrial communities in the State of New York directly affected by the five unbuilt dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers.

"Subsequently, the following communities in New York State and Pennsylvania have filed letters with your committee urging that the authorized dams be constructed: Owego, Tioga County, N. Y.; Plymouth, Luzerne County, Pa.; Sayre, Bradford County, Pa.; Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa.; Danville, Montour County, Pa.; Terrytown, Bradford County, Pa.; Athens, Bradford County, Pa.; Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pa.; Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa.

"The mighty Susquehanna River is over 400 miles long and the retention reservoirs on tributaries in New York State would benefit scores of communities in New York State and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thus justifying the relatively minor expenditure of money in an interstate project, compared to the hundreds of millions which have been spent in other States.

"III. PROMPT ACTION NECESSARY

"The history of building of flood-control reservoirs shows that with the inflationary trend of our times every year's delay means more in the cost of the building of the dams.

"To date, according to reliable advice from the Army engineers, over \$500,000 has been spent in the design, planning, field work, and preparation of data by the Corps of Engineers. Any rejection of the dam would be a wasteful throwing away of valuable man-hours and materials spent on the projects.

"IV. THE QUESTION OF 'LOCAL OPPOSITION' HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE CONGRESS AND DISPOSED OF

"Prior to the enactment of the 1936 and 1944 acts by which Congress authorized and approved the 5 remaining unbuilt dry reservoirs, hearings were held and the usual 'local opposition' was considered. Congress used the following language:

"The projects 'are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted in the order of their emergency as may be directed by the President under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, etc.'"

"No 'newly discovered' opposition has been presented beyond that which was originally presented. The same type of 'local opposition' is encountered in every public works project whether it be a highway, a bridge, or a dam.

"V. 'THERE ARE NO ALTERNATIVE METHODS'

"Some misguided zealots try to stir up local opposition by saying that there are other methods by which large communities can be protected from excessive flood damages, such as soil conservation and forest management.

"Responsible supporters of the soil-conservation program of the Department of Agriculture do not claim that the development of small watersheds will play a major part in waterflow retardation on the main rivers. Every flood-control measure helps, but soil erosion and harnessing of small streams are minor factors. Soil conservation promotional groups have done such a good job of publicizing their program that now the Department of Agriculture is issuing the warning that soil conservation is not major flood protection.

"Mr. Hugh M. Wilson, soil conservationist of Cornell University, stated: 'While it is not expected that headwater measures will control major floods, they will help reduce damages. However, most of the benefits will be in the immediate vicinity and, until work has been done on all tributaries, cities downstream can expect little benefit.'

"VI. BOTH URBAN AND RURAL POPULATIONS WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE DAM

"It is true that the population of the communities represented by the undersigned council, according to the 1955 New York State Department of Commerce census, is 197,462. It is true that we are an industrial community; that we have a total of 181 industries in Broome County including such outstanding nationwide industries as: Endicott Johnson Corp.; International Business Machines Corp.; Link Aviation, Inc.; Ansco and Ozalid Divisions of General Aniline & Film Corp.; Kroehler Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co., Aeronautics Division.

"But farmers too will benefit from the proposed dams.

"The following are excerpts from letters received from farmers whose lands are below the proposed dams:

"Excerpts from letter No. 1

"We own 80 acres in the Susquehanna Valley which has in the last 3 days been about 70 percent under water."

"The East Sidney dam kept back sufficient water to prevent a serious situation. Any dam or dams east of our property would greatly relieve the ever-present threat of summer as well as winter or spring flooding."

"Another foot of water above the recent high point would have flooded our barn and required the movement of cattle and other property."

"Excerpt from letter No. 2

"Received your letter concerning the Davenport Center of West Oneonta Dam project. In regard to myself I would undoubtedly be benefited by it. Each year at flood time I lose a good many feet along the river bank of my river flat. Eventually, without control, there will be no river flat at all. I'm sincerely in favor of this project."

"Excerpt from letter No. 3

"I lost all the manure on my land and it also washed about 30 feet of land away. We had some benefit by the East Sidney Dam, but I would be benefited just as much or more by the two other dams."

"Excerpt from letter No. 4

"On the other hand the high water here does damage the property of several of my neighbors and I would be in favor of any dam that might prevent the flooding."

"Excerpt from letter No. 5

"I don't like to see people lose their homes, but if they live by the river they sure think as I do, what if we get a bad flood in the night as we did some years ago. East Sidney took a lot of farms and homes, but it has helped a lot."

"Excerpts from letter No. 6

"I have 10 acres of flatland along the river which about 75 percent of it is flooded. Before the East Sidney Dam was built and also the dam removed below Harpursville my flat was completely flooded. This meant washing of the riverbank and the flat also. It always meant a late start for oats, too."

"I certainly believe something has to be done and done soon. If we ever get a flood like Pennsylvania had, it will be pretty hard on Binghamton. I haven't helped you much, I know, only to say I agree with a proposed dam on the river."

"What better proof can we have that farmers below the dams who would be benefited thereby are in favor of the project?"

"Respectfully submitted.

"BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL,

"By the following officers:

"GEORGE G. COUGHLIN,  
Chairman.

"JOHN BRUNNER,  
Vice Chairman.

"HEATH D. ANDREWS,  
Secretary-Treasurer."

Governor HARRIMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Governor; thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. STERLING COLE. I appear today to show I am a strong supporter of the recommendation advanced by the Governor.

Mr. ROONEY. We are indeed honored to have the distinguished gentleman from New York with us this morning.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and in view of the facts brought out in the hearings held by this committee on the subject, I accept the amendment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first of all may I say that I am quite amazed at this amendment and at my very dear friend who is proposing it. I had no idea he was so interested in my district and in that part of the State. I was happy to see that he had a map so that he could really find out exactly where these places are.

Now, of course, we have been talking about this project for many years. This is nothing new at all. The people in Delaware County, the farmers in Davenport Center that my dear friend brushes aside so lightly as being 49 parcels of property or some such thing, constitute a very prosperous farming area of over 300 inhabitants. That, of course, may seem nothing to the House of Representatives. We deal daily in billions of dollars and in millions of population. The people of this part of my district have no intention of penalizing or hurting their good friends in the triple cities. They go there constantly and they have their interests at heart. I go to this district constantly. I have never seen these horrible floods and these holocausts that have been mentioned today. Yes, there has been some flooding, certainly, and there has been some damage but, thank God, nothing like the damage that there has been in other parts of the State where so far absolutely nothing has been done. Already a great part of the property of the farmers of Delaware County has been sacrificed to the Downsview Dam.

Now, what the Delaware County people want—and I support them in their wishes, which I think are perfectly fair and natural—is the opportunity to determine by professional surveys whether or not protective measures, at least as great as those believed to be possible from the construction of this tremendous project, cannot be achieved through a series of small dams and through soil and forest conservation. And, there are many experts who believe this can be done. As against this sensible approach, the construction of the Davenport Center Dam would cost, according to the last estimate I have had from the Army engineers, \$12.1 million. It would

completely inundate 2,175 acres of good farmland—this is not just scrub land; it is good farmland, the best dairy county in the State of New York—a figure the Corps of Engineers gave me in a letter dated April 7, 1954. It would involve relocating 4 miles of railroad, constructing a railroad station, relocating 2 miles of State highway and various other very costly enterprises. What is most devastating, it would completely take out of operation some of the best dairy country in the East and would mean the loss of livelihood for the entire population of the area. In fact, it has been calculated that the loss of income, if this dam is built, to the people of the area would be \$1 million per annum.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of letters concerning this dam. I have put these letters in the hearings, and may I say to my good friend, I wish he would read them. There are 32 pages of them. I have also included resolutions from the towns and from the supervisors of that entire district. They are all the same. They come from neighboring towns, from Oneonta, from Harpersville, East Meredith, all of whom will suffer if this enormous, gigantic dam is constructed. The people of Delaware County, in opposing this costly venture, are in no sense promoting their own selfish interests. They are as anxious as anyone to see that the people of Binghamton are protected, but they believe it can be done without this tremendous cost and without interfering with the welfare of the residents of that entire area. They belong, I am sorry to say, to that very small segment of the population of our country—and it is unfortunate that it is so small—that believes results can be accomplished without adding still another huge burden to the already overburdened taxpayers.

I respectfully urge this House to give these local people the time to complete their studies before adding to this appropriation bill an item which the Bureau of the Budget has not included and which, to my mind, is completely unnecessary. This item does not appear in the bill. It seems that my good friend in his kindheartedness has gone out and pulled it out of the air. Why not let it go over for the present at least?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I did not pull this project out of the air. Perhaps the gentlewoman does not know that the highly distinguished Governor of the State of New York, accompanied by 20 highly responsible citizens of the area, testified in its behalf before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to my friend that I am fully aware of that fact, but is my friend aware of the fact that I testified also? That may be very important to him, but I testified with 40 people from my district. I can assure the gentleman that my testimony, although it was given less attention, was quite as good as that given by our mutual friend, the Governor of the great State of New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the kindly gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my kindly friend, always.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I read every word of her testimony. After having read it, I admire her more than ever, but I disagree with her as much as ever.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend. May I say that I also read the testimony. I would not want my friend to think that I did not know what the Governor had said. I am fully cognizant of it. But I still think it is an unfortunate proceeding to give the people of a district something that they do not want, something for which they will have to pay. And I have always understood that it was rather an unusual proceeding on the part of a congressional committee, that as a general rule that is not the case. And I would like to quote to my friend something that was said at the hearing by my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. He said, at the end of my testimony:

I might say, Mrs. St. GEORGE, that we have enough requests for dams for which the people are unanimous in the localities involved and personally I do not intend to go along with any project to which there is local opposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am still of that very decided opinion. I was present as a member of the subcommittee and I listened very carefully to the lady and her group; and I was also present when the Governor of New York, Mr. Harriman, was present and testified. In my opinion, the Governor and his group made a very poor presentation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My sympathies are entirely with the people up above who are going to lose their homes because, as the lady has well stated, this is an unnecessary project. It will not help the city of Binghamton because, after all, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will explain later, the testimony will show that the flood control wall itself will amply protect Binghamton. Certainly the whole project is unjustifiable. The lady is to be complimented for the splendid and courageous fight she has made to defeat this project.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can tell my friend that the flood wall has already helped the city of Binghamton and that the experts of the Corps of Engineers of the Army have told us that the best that the city of Binghamton may expect from the construction of this dam is a maximum control of 2 inches; that will be the maximum and, of course, the minimum will be considerably less.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we expect to complete this bill tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, that



time to be allotted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN objected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If we adopt a request to limit debate, and I am constrained to go along with such a request, of course, will it prevent me from offering an amendment which in effect might change the amount of the figure which we now have under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. If an amendment is adopted changing the figure, that freezes the figure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the 20 minutes to be consumed by the four Members who are standing.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was permitted to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. KEARNEY.)

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose in principle the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to provide for the construction of a dam at Davenport Center, Delaware County, N. Y., a county which adjoins one in my own 32d Congressional District, namely Otsego County.

For many years past I have spent considerable time before boards of Army engineers with reference to several flood-control projects not only in my own district but also in areas adjoining my district which projects were directed at districts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. Over the strenuous opposition of the entire three congressional districts of my colleagues named above and myself, we find ourselves in the position of year in and year out opposing projects which would cost at least \$45 million—remember, at least \$45 million—and which would be of no practical or economic value.

Let me picture to you some data from the United States Geological Survey concerning the Davenport Center project on Charlotte Creek, Delaware County, N. Y.—the one in issue under the present amendment. The report from the Geological Survey shows the maximum streamflows of record on the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River was 61,600 cubic feet per second. The recently constructed floodwalls and other local protection facilities are reported to provide for a flood flow of 80,000 cubic feet per second, or over 30 percent greater than any flow of record. The flood of record—61,600 cubic feet per second—occurred on March 18, 1936, and the next largest of record—60,500 cubic feet per second—

occurred on March 22, 1948. Since both those record flows, the East Sidney Reservoir has been constructed which is expected to reduce the flood potential at Binghamton.

The flood flows of record on the Susquehanna River at Vestal just below Binghamton and below the confluence of the Chenango River are reported as 107,000 cubic feet per second in March 1936 and as 114,000 cubic feet per second in 1865, the latter being based on reported high-water marks of that time. The Whitney Point Reservoir in the Chenango River Basin was completed in 1942 and reportedly will reduce flood flows of the Chenango at Binghamton by over 16 percent. The presently authorized local flood protection works for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, for which construction funds are budgeted for 1957, are to provide for flood flows of 125,000 cubic feet per second or 10 percent greater than flows of record before construction of the two existing flood-control reservoirs.

It is also of interest to note that the Chenango River contributes from 30 to 45 percent of the major flood flows of the Susquehanna at Vestal. The Davenport Center Dam, of course, would have no effect on the Chenango River flows.

The drainage area of Charlotte Creek at Davenport Center is only 164 square miles or slightly over 7 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River and slightly over 4 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Vestal below the confluence of the Chenango River. The Charlotte Creek flows at Davenport Center at the time of flood flows of record at Binghamton were around 5,000 cubic feet per second or less.

Summarizing, it is readily apparent that the Davenport Center Dam would have almost negligible effect on the stage height and flood flows of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton and Vestal.

It should also be noted that based on present estimated cost of \$12,100,000, the cost per acre-foot of flood-control storage at the proposed Davenport Center Reservoir is extremely high. If, as has been indicated, the actual cost may be nearly double the present estimate of cost, then the actual cost per acre-foot of storage would be astronomical.

Davenport Center Dam is over 90 miles away from Binghamton and a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second would have no effect at all upon the situation in Binghamton. It is too far away. If all the water that the stream produces came down and was impounded, it would make no difference. On the other hand, the reservoir at Whitney Point was set by the engineers to reduce the flood flow of the Chenango at Binghamton over 16 percent. This would reduce any flood waters down to a point that would be less than 90,000 cubic feet per second on the Susquehanna. This is a 35,000-foot-per-second margin against the 125,000 cubic feet per second of flood protection at Vestal, Endicott, and Johnson City provided in the bill according to the testimony given by the Corps of Engineers and would not make a difference of over 2 inches. Is the cost of

this project worth the amount of money requested in this amendment?

Let me go further, if you will, please.

In rallying to the aid of those persons who are pleading for the abolition of the Davenport Center project, I do so with the firm conviction that the carrying out of this planned undertaking would be illogical and economically unsound. The idea of holding back floodwater in enormous dams might be entertained where it is possible to utilize canyons and barren land of little or no value, but in locations such as the Davenport Center area, there are other measures which are much better or equally adequate at a cost which is not prohibitive.

Flood protection for the triple cities, Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, could be had for a very few dollars by impounding basins in the upper regions of the North Susquehanna River and its branches and by developing reforestation in the hills. This kind of procedure would result in no substantial property loss, no requirement of building bridges, and very little land to acquire. It would cost only about 10 to 15 percent of the dam project, and the reforestation program would also help to replenish our fast-disappearing forests.

The advantages of small basins or reservoirs in flood-control protection are:

First. Speed of construction.

Second. Safety to lives and property.

Third. Flexibility of operations: An acre-foot of suitably apportioned multiple storage—small reservoir—will have an effective control value of 4 acre-feet in a single large reservoir located downstream.

Fourth. Erosion control.

The economic benefits expected, if the dam is built, will be considerably less than the actual losses which are easily determined. Never, except on very rare occasions, have the flood waters of the Susquehanna reached such proportions as to cause more than slight inconvenience to the areas of the Susquehanna. Therefore, it seems that a less drastic method of flood control than the one planned by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, would adequately take care of the situation.

The area involved under this amendment is a rich farming and residential section of New York State. It is dotted with small communities, closely related and interdependent in matters of milk production, school, church and business. It contains the usual network of highways, and a railway which serves the valley. It doesn't take much imagination to realize the hardship that would be caused by the complete and final destruction of a large section of the area to construct a huge flood control dam. In planning such projects, perhaps the Army engineers do not include the sentimental aspects involved. Yet they are important. Consider what it will mean to render several hundred people homeless, the breaking of family ties and friendship, the destruction of ancestral homes, the desolation of cemeteries, the frustrated plans for the future and the necessity to start over somewhere else.

Even if sentiment has no place in the picture, the financial cost of the Davenport Center Dam is sufficient to justify

dropping the plans at once. In addition to construction costs, there is the matter of compensating the farmers, homeowners, and business concerns for their property taken. We should consider the financial problems that would result from the disruption of central school districts, the cost of building new highways, the perpetual cost of maintaining the dam and many other costs which cannot be assessed in advance.

For some time the threat—the dam project—hanging over this area has been doing much damage. Real estate values are affected, public officials and private citizens hesitate to make improvements and are at a loss to know how to plan for the future. I am sure that the Army engineers understand the amount of damage that will be done if the dam is constructed as well as the damage being done by a delayed decision. I therefore suggest that this amendment be defeated.

Only 2 years ago, after several years of hearings, the Army engineers reporting on the north branch of the Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York and Pennsylvania, said, and I quote, "the reporting officers gave further consideration to the matter of a reservoir at Mount Upton on the Unadilla River but in view of the intense local opposition, they do not recommend authorization of a project at this location."

The engineers know that by building small dams and ponds on feeder streams it will save millions of dollars to the taxpayers without the entailing loss of thousands of acres of the best farmland in the State of New York—upheaval of homes—destruction of businesses—resultant loss of taxes—communities wiped out—and people made to start life all over again after having lived in this area for many, many years as their ancestors did. No, my colleagues, the building of a flood-control dam at Davenport Center, in the words of one citizen, "Would be a tragedy of major proportions."

Since March 27, when the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the former chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and myself appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have been bombarded with hundreds of letters protesting the erection of this dam, and these letters, my colleagues, come from parts of my own district as well as from Davenport Center. This in view of the fact that high officials of the State of New York say that only a few people are against this project. Why are the people of my district opposed to this particular project? For the reason that they fear for the rest of their own areas—fear that once one project is voted by this committee, many others of the same nature in the adjoining areas will be voted and the result, as I have said before, will be chaos—loss of homes—valuable farmland—uprooting of complete communities, and a new start in life somewhere else—the building of unnecessary and expensive projects—and I ask you to vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York

[Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I was to have 5 minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not of that understanding. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would have 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. COLE. The request was that the gentleman from New York will close the debate. I also qualify under that characterization, being in support of the amendment; and, under the rules of the House, it is my understanding that I would be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that a member of the committee is entitled to close the debate if he so desires.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be recognized to close the debate?

Mr. TABER. I desire to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather unusual and unique experience for me to rise in support of an amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROONEY], appropriating additional funds for flood control. It is unique because very rarely do I take the floor or vote for amendments to increase appropriations. However, in view of the fact that the people I represent will be benefited by this appropriation, and further in view of the fact that a great percentage of the money to support the appropriations made by this Congress comes from the taxpayers of New York State. I do not mind getting up once in a while and asking for a little aid for the people of New York State.

Then the other reason why this is unique for me is to find myself in such diametric opposition to my good friends and colleagues, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Mr. FABER, and Mr. KEARNEY, whose districts surround me geographically in New York and who personally surround me this afternoon on the floor with their guns pointed toward me and my people.

I was somewhat amazed by an expression made by one of those who have already spoken. It is understandable that people whose land is being taken away from them for the dam site should protest. It is understandable that they should protest to their Representatives in Congress and that their Representatives should voice here in the House the protests of their constituents. What I do find it hard to understand is that in the expression of such protests they should lose sight of the broader picture; in expressing a view which is narrow and borders on provincialism they lose sight of the benefits and the savings of life and property of thousands and thousands of people who live downstream. They say leave us alone who live upstream and let the people downstream take care of themselves. What crass selfishness!

I was here in Congress and assisted when the authorization for these dams was made 20 years ago, and we did not hear a single protest made by the land-

owners then. As a matter of fact, 4 or 5 dams have actually been constructed since then and not a word of protest or complaint has been made by the owners of the lands that were used for those dams. It just so happens in the last 2 years because of the recurrence of these floods the people living downstream, the victims of this short, this narrow, this provincial attitude are beginning to be awakened to the danger under which they are constantly living and are asking for the completion of this program laid out by the Army engineers 20 years ago, and asking that the remaining dams be built.

I shall not argue the technical aspects of the engineers' recommendations but am ready to be guided by their advice; in fact I prefer their engineering advice to that given me by Faber, St. George & Kearney, Inc. Whether their specifications ask for 2 inches of flood protection, or half an inch, or even it may be a quarter of an inch, if it is enough to protect the properties of these people from being flooded or being silted up and to save their lives, then I say it is money well invested.

It has been said that it will cost \$45 million to complete this project. The truth is that the Corps of Engineers says it will cost only \$14 million. And this appropriation today is for \$1 million.

But it does seem that after 20 years of patient waiting the people who are to be benefited by this improvement ought not be brushed aside by the selfish attitudes of narrow people.

I would also call your attention to the fact that these are what we call dry dams. All that the Government acquires is the flowage rights, the right to inundate the land in question in case of excessive rainfall. For long periods of time the land is available for use just as it has always been used for centuries. Occasionally, maybe 1 year out of 10, the land is inundated to a depth of some considerable feet for a limited period of time. Eventually that water runs off and the farmer comes back in, he plows his land and sows his crop the same as he has in the past. We are not confiscating valuable dairy land permanently. We are simply buying the right to flood that land with excessive rainwater in order to protect the poor, innocent, helpless victims who live downstream. I do not blame my colleagues for getting up and arguing about the protection of the folks living high and dry on the mountaintops but the rest of us should give attention and consideration to the people living downstream, not only in the Triple Cities area but all the way down the Susquehanna River.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to commend the gentleman for the highly interesting and important statement which he is making and for bringing out his point with regard to the fact that the reservoir land is not taken permanently. May I for the sake of emphasis ask him to answer this question: Is it not the fact that the State of New York in connection with projects such as this does



not take the landowner's title in fee simple away from him?

Mr. COLE. That is my understanding. All the Government acquires is the flowage right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this particular dam, the Davenport Center Dam, is 90 miles upstream from the city of Binghamton. It cannot possibly be of value to the people of the city of Binghamton. The flood walls which this committee is providing in the pending bill before us today will protect the city of Binghamton against 126,000 cubic feet per second. The highest water of record was away back in 1865 when they had 114,000 cubic feet per second recorded at that point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman would repeat those figures for the benefit of the Committee.

Mr. TABER. One hundred and twenty-six thousand cubic feet of water would be protected against by the flood wall.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just what was the previous high?

Mr. TABER. The previous high was 114,000 in 1865.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, this would be just squandering money?

Mr. TABER. That is all. On top of that since the reservoir at Whitney Point was put in, it has really been effective in holding back water because it will hold back 82,000 acre-feet. It has not resulted in a single high-water period in Binghamton anywhere near the old record; 92,000 is the highest record and that was in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, the picture is just simply this: The damage which would be done as the result of each 1 of these 5 dams that some of these promoters, and that is what it is, want to put across would run a million dollars a year as to each one of these setups. They have had surveys made and estimates made, so they know what they are talking about. The result of the thing would be that these people upstream would have 10 times as much damage as could possibly result to the city of Binghamton.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman agree with me that this is the opening wedge and once the Army engineers get their foot into the Davenport Center Dam, there are to be at least 2 other dams constructed with a resultant cost of between forty-five and sixty million dollars?

Mr. TABER. Well, it will be at least as much as that. But, these dams are absolutely unnecessary and will not serve a good purpose. Now, why should we go ahead and vote for something that will do no good at all and which is backed by a group of promoters who are

stirred up by a little fellow from Binghamton?

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

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

Mr. COLE. I do not care to have the gentleman disclose the identity of this little fellow from Binghamton who is stirring it up, but I would like to have him assure me that he will identify the individual to me at a later time.

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly I will. No doubt about that. Everybody in New York State knows who it is and knows what he is doing. I think he is a great promoter.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Congress will not go overboard and vote to start in on this program. There are three projects in my district, in Chenango County, that they want to put in. The cost of those would be over \$50 million. There is one in the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], that they want to put in. The cost of that would be enormous. This particular one, before they get through with it, would run to \$20 million. Let us not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 117.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are very anxious to finish this bill tonight. I ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section, and all amendments thereto, time for debate on each amendment be limited to 5 minutes, to be consumed by the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there be 5 minutes on a side, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. In concurrence with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section and all amendments thereto debate on each amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the proponent and 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Reserving the right to object, by that the gentleman means the opposition on the committee; does he not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; certainly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs: On page 16, line 4, strike out "\$421,734,000" and in-

sert in lieu thereof "\$422,034,000, of which \$300,000 shall be for the project 'Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.'"

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that this amendment would have been adopted in the committee on yesterday had our Louisiana Member not unavoidably been absent in Louisiana.

This amendment makes it possible for the Army engineers to do necessary initial work on the Mississippi River Gulf outlet, which is a continuation of the channel from the port of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico, shortening the distance by approximately 40 miles. This is supported by every area and every group throughout the midcontinent of the United States.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. This project, as my colleague knows, is located entirely within the district which I represent in the city of New Orleans.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. HEBERT. However, the fact that it is in the district which I represent does not indicate that it is a strictly local proposition. It is one of community and nationwide interest, as I believe the gentleman indicates by the fact that he offers the amendment now to have the planning money put into this bill at this time.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might add in connection with what the gentleman has said that to the best of my knowledge every governor in the midcontinent area of the United States has approved this project. This means that if an explosion or an eruption should occur at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which serves the second port of the United States and the greatest trading area in the midcontinent area of the United States, if that delta area should explode, as has happened in the past in the case of the River Nile and other great rivers in the history of the world, then this great trading area would not be blocked out from the commerce of the world.

May I add that this project has been under active study and consideration by the Army engineers since 1943. It was naturally and unfortunately suspended during World War II. It has now been unanimously approved by both our body and the other body. By the approval of \$300,000 today, the work should be able to go forward within the next several years.

Mr. HEBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is co-author of this bill. I think it would be wise at this time to inform the House as to the benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. It is very high. I think it is 1.54 to 1. I am certain the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee, is familiar with this project. I discussed it with some of my good colleagues here and hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to go along with this amendment, which is so vitally important to the

whole midcontinental area of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, here is another case. I am not going to take the responsibility that properly belongs to the majority members of this subcommittee who presented this report to the House. I do think the Members of the House should know that this is an \$88 million project which was just authorized in March of this year. There are a lot of other projects with just as favorable benefit to cost ratio which have been authorized for a much longer period of time than this project which are waiting their turn for appropriations by the Congress. I do not find any evidence of the urgent nature of this project which would push this \$88 million project ahead of a great many other projects located in other parts of the country, which have been authorized, as I said, for a much longer period of time than this one has been authorized. But, as I said, if the majority members of the subcommittee will not take their responsibility, I do not know why I should be the goat and say, "No." If they are willing to accept it, it is up to them.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman and I think that when the gentleman has time to study the project he will find that this project is of equal importance to the people of Wisconsin, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas and all of the other great midcontinental area States of our Nation as it is to those of us who happen to live at the mouth of the great Mississippi River.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I merely want to say that I favored this project in the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman favored this project.

Mr. RABAUT. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.54 to 1 which is a pretty good benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, unless someone decides to use the last 5 minutes, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brooks of Louisiana: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word "Provided", insert the following: "In addition the sum of \$300,000 for engineering, planning and designing for the Overton-Red River Waterway."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this project was originally approved in 1946. Since then there have been appropriations by the Congress in several separate instances. Last year, we approved \$175,000 for planning money. This amendment would simply add the sum of \$300,000 for planning and that is for the purpose of bringing the planning up-to-date so that the project

will be tangible from the point of cost and ability to execute. The project, as I say, was approved by the Army Engineers. It was approved by the Congress in 1946. At one time, Mr. Chairman, we actually had this money for planning appropriated, but the war in Korea came along and we had to surrender the money and turn it back. Since then there have been appropriations of almost \$400,000 for planning and this is simply an addition to that amount to bring the planning up-to-date. The Bureau of the Budget approved this project. I think it was overlooked by the committee because the hearings were before two different subcommittees.

But this project is at the point if you do not go forward with it you will lose some of the investment you have already in the planning. It is extremely important that we do this. It provides for a waterway in the Red River Valley—not the Mississippi Valley. It is in the Red River Valley. It would start below the city of Shreveport and follow the valley in a southeasterly direction to the Atchafalaya River; and, when completed, that waterway would provide navigation for the great empire in the southwest. It would cover, for instance, the cities of Texarkana, Shreveport, Marshall, Tex., and parts of south Arkansas and all of north Louisiana. As I say, our purpose in asking for these funds is simply to go ahead with the planning which has been approved by the Bureau of Engineers, the Budget, and everybody. We ask for the \$300,000 because that would bring the planning down to the point where the engineers can say exactly what the cost of the whole thing will be. The original cost ratio was 2 to 1. Now we have had the Korean war in the meantime. We want to be fair, so we want to have that cost-benefit ratio reestablished, and this will reestablish that figure.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that I regret on account of certain features in this that I cannot agree to it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Then I want to use the remainder of my time. This matter has been before the committee and the committee has approved it and Congress has approved it time and time again. The amendment is in order because it proceeds with the planning. It is a most worthwhile project. In that valley, 300 miles west of the Mississippi River, 40 miles south of Arkansas, and 12 miles east of the State of Texas there are many, many cities that are badly in need of navigation. We have found that these cities will provide a million dollars' worth of transportation every year for oil and gas alone in that area. It will provide for millions of dollars of freight from our lumber industry and for other industries in that great area.

It is an extremely important project, and I hope that this committee will go along and give us the planning funds that we need so badly.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Much as I regret to go against my good friend from Louisiana, nevertheless here we have the beginning of a project costing at least \$88½ million dollars and perhaps considerably more. We have here a project to which there is local opposition, as exemplified by Congressman Long being against it. We have a project designed for navigation purposes, yet you have three important railroads paralleling that particular route. We have a project which will take a considerable amount of good farmland out of production, and a project to which many local people down there are opposed.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me say to the gentleman that in the matter of surveys I will read from a letter I have, sent by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner:

You will note from the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, that on page 552 et seq. that General Hardin, in discussing this project, pointed out that due to the long interval between authorization of this project and the many changes that have taken place in the economy of the region, it is felt necessary and desirable to review the economics of this project before construction funds are requested. The planning funds included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 would review the engineering and economics of this project in order to establish current construction costs and benefits.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding as much as he did.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to quote from the testimony of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long], which appears at page 912 of the hearings. He states this:

The proposed Overton-Red River project is to be a canal cut parallel to the Red River largely through my congressional district. It is proposed to pump the water out of the Red River into this canal to float barges to Shreveport. It was authorized in 1946.

The land in this area is good farming land and a great many of the farmers, constituents of mine, are objecting to having their farms cut into two separate pieces with probably no bridges to give them access to their divided property. In addition, they complain that they will have to pay taxes on their property to provide the funds the local area must provide for land acquisition, changes in highways and new bridges for existing highways.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision at present for local interests in any way to have the necessary taxing authority to permit local contribution, and I certainly hope this amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In confirmation of what the gentleman from Minnesota said, I quote the following statement by General Hardin during the course of the hearings on this project:

General HARDIN. The Waterways Commission study has gotten to the point where they



are getting set up so that they can have the taxing authority which will be necessary to carry their share of the undertaking. The legislature which is coming up will consider the enactment of those provisions in the laws of Louisiana.

It seems to me that for this Congress to appropriate money without the necessary authorization and assurance of local participation that is required would be setting a precedent that would come back to haunt us in the years ahead.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter guaranteeing local participation. I do not know whether it is in the hearings or not but there is such a confirmation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But no legislative authorization of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But a State commission has been set up known as the Overton-Red River Waterway Commission which is a State commission and which is now participating. So in reference to this project the State is participating.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin. Not to the extent of being authorized to provide their financial share of the undertaking.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter of commitment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word "Provided," insert the following: "and in addition the sum of \$1,000,000 for construction funds on Buckhorn Reservoir."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Kentucky River is navigable for approximately 250 miles subject to frequent floods. There is not a single reservoir or flood-control project in the headwaters of this stream. The Comprehensive Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized the Buckhorn Reservoir on the middle fork of the Kentucky River. The planning survey of this reservoir has been completed and a district Army engineer's office at Louisville, Ky., is preparing the necessary data to advertise for construction contract.

The budget included an item of \$1 million for the initiation of this contract work during the coming fiscal year. This amount was deleted by the Appropriations Committee. The sole purpose of this amendment is to restore the amount included in the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for construction purposes. There is no objection to this reservoir in the area in which it is located. The down-river communities are hoping that it will be completed at the earliest possible date as they face repeated flood damage that is oftentimes disastrous. Beattyville alone has suffered more than a half-million dollars' damage from Kentucky River floods.

This reservoir will not only lower the flood crest in the entire Kentucky River Valley from this point northward, but

would also have immeasurable effect upon the Ohio River flood stage.

I urge this Committee to approve this amendment so that an early start may be made on the construction of this essential flood-control reservoir.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted by unanimous vote, as I recall it, a very salutary provision under which we determined at the beginning of the hearings not to accept any proposal on which there was a poorer ratio than 1.3 to 1. The ratio on this is 1.2 to 1. That means we did not and cannot consider it.

Furthermore, as a result of additional estimates, within this last year the total cost has gone up from \$7,020,000 to \$9,990,000, a 40-percent increase in the estimate.

And the corps has already spent \$70,000 to complete plans for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 84, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALEXANDER: On page 16, line 24, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the planning or construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Actually I had intended to strike out the figure "\$25,000" which is shown on page 14 of the report for the Wilkesboro Reservoir, but due to the fact that the figures on page 16, line 4, have been amended, it is impossible to do that. The only thing I am asking by this amendment is that no funds in this bill be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11319 provides an appropriation of \$25,000 for advanced planning to determine the feasibility of constructing a dam or dams on the Yadkin River, which is in Wilkes County, N. C.

My predecessor, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton, for many years fought the construction of these dams, due to the fact that it would adversely affect the people living in Caldwell County, N. C., which is in the congressional district I represent, by inundating their homes, schools, churches, and much fertile, agricultural land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to be put in the position of being against flood control or soil conservation. I am not. I think, however, that this particular project would do more damage than it would rectify and that the proposed dam is not economically feasible.

It is my understanding, according to the reports of the Corps of Engineers, the proposed dam or dams are calculated to cost approximately \$12 million and would partially protect only \$5 million worth of agricultural and industrial property below the dams, while requiring \$466 thousand annual upkeep.

I have in my possession a petition signed by some 400 Wilkes and Caldwell County farmers, as well as letters from the board of county commissioners and the Lenoir Chamber of Commerce of Caldwell County, and many others, vigorously opposing any further appropriation for the planning or construction of the proposed dam or dams, for which I understand there has already been expended, by the Corps of Engineers, approximately \$165,000.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is completely justified in the position he has taken on the basis of the record which was made in our committee and I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE: On page 16, line 4, after the sum named, insert "and in addition \$100,000 to be utilized for additional planning of Strawn Reservoir, Kans."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this is 1 of 4 key dams located on the upper reaches of the Arkansas River Watershed. This project was originally approved in 1949 and in 1951 extensive planning money was granted. In 1953, after the expenditure of part of the planning money, in core drilling for the dam site it was discovered that there was a fault under the proposed dam. That compelled the Army Engineers to move downstream, to hunt for a new dam site. Fortunately they found one that will cut \$10 million from the proposed cost.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the thinking of the gentleman and I trust that his amendment will carry. Because of the delay encountered we can save at least a year in the construction of this much-needed installation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. We people who live on the Arkansas River Upper Watershed are asking you people to pick up the amount of money granted to us this year, the year that we lost due to no fault of the Army engineers and no fault of the people who live in this river valley. I have

been informed by the Army engineers that this will complete the planning of this one key dam that is located in the State of Kansas. I want to say that water and water conservation in our State is our No. 1 problem. Frankly, in my congressional district I have 4 counties with 12 percent of unemployment. The reason we cannot get large industry to come in there and take up the unemployment is the fact that we do not have an assured water supply for a large industrial development.

Up until 1951 this river valley on an average had two floods a year. So you can see that it is imperative that we go ahead as fast, as expeditiously as we can.

This project has been approved. The Army engineers ask for a budget of \$50,000 and I am asking that we have enough money to complete the planning so that we can get into construction if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to grant us construction money next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another case where there is some money in the budget for it. There is still some lingering local opposition to the project, as the committee has been informed. That raises the question as to whether the planning ought to be rushed to completion by an additional \$100,000 this year.

I think it is completely proper that there be the \$50,000 that the Bureau of the Budget has already recommended in order that the planning can proceed in an orderly fashion, but I would be afraid of rushing this thing through to completion of the planning until such items as the lingering local opposition and the rather marginal benefit-to-cost ratio on the basis of the present plans have been cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEORGE) there were, ayes 37, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 16, line 24, strike the period and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds in this section be used for the construction of Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas."

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor much earlier this afternoon to discuss this amendment I have now offered. I do not want to present any false illusions about this. This is not a new project, as most of you know. The dam is under construction. Nevertheless, I feel constrained to offer this amendment as my district has decided on three different occasions that this project was not to the best interest of the First District of Kansas.

I have been very much interested in the discussion here this afternoon, especially the exchange of remarks between the various Members from the State of New York. In this instance, the name

could have been changed from Davenport City Dam to Tuttle Creek Dam. I think all those arguments have been used a good many times on the floor of this House relative to the particular project I am addressing myself to this afternoon. Despite the fact that this was recommended by the subcommittee and included in the bill by the full committee. I am still offering my amendment for the consideration of the committee this afternoon. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, not only do I think this project is not justified, but I think the House should take another look at the treatment given to displaced persons affected by Federal reservoir projects. That does not apply only to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas, but it applies to every reservoir that we have discussed on the floor this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly grateful that you are in the chair this afternoon not only because the members of this committee may have the benefit of your wisdom in presiding over the Committee of the Whole but also I have a bill pending before your committee which I think will take care, to a large extent, of part of the inequity that exists in relation to the land acquisition program and displaced persons relative to a Federal project. I am referring specifically to the capital-gains tax angle.

As I said earlier this afternoon, land owners are forced off their land by Federal projects and are treated just the same as speculators in real estate in any State of the Union. I do not think that is fair and I do not think it is fair in the minds of the Congress, if they would stop to consider that point. We are told that land owners must yield to a Federal project in the national interest. I repeat, if it is to the national interest to build these projects, it is certainly to the national interest to reimburse these people justly for the property that is taken away from them by right of eminent domain. As I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there is also a new policy as to land acquisition that was adopted in 1953. The proposition of an easement instead of acquisition of fee title. Under the easement policy, the displaced person cannot get all of his capital out of his investment to relocate elsewhere but is just sort of half choked, I believe is the way to say it. His operations are disrupted, but nevertheless he is still confined to his original site and he cannot relocate to another area. I want to make it clear that this is not the fault of the Army engineers. It is the fault of the Congress because the engineers are only able to operate the land acquisition policy as it is laid down by the law of the Congress and as it is administered by the administrative branch of the Government of the United States. These are two inequities which exist. The third one is that there is no provision for the reimbursement of businessmen who are displaced by a project. Farmers are reimbursed to the extent of the appraised value of their farm. In the case of a merchant who has been in business for 40 years, he is only reimbursed to the extent of the real value of his business. In other words, there is no value attached

to what we may call the intangible or what the courts have described as consequential damages. If these projects are as good as we have been told on the floor this afternoon, certainly, a few more thousand dollars for displaced persons would not greatly alter the cost-benefit ratio of any individual project. I certainly implore you, Mr. Chairman, to consider the bill before your committee, and I also hope that the Committee on Public Works will consider the bill pending before their committee to authorize reimbursement to businessmen. There are about 100 of them who are displaced by this project.

As I stated previously, my opposition to the Tuttle Creek project remains unchanged, notwithstanding the unfavorable action of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in appropriating an additional \$7,500,000 to continue its construction. I do not have to remind the committee that this action was taken without a favorable report from this subcommittee. There is considerable doubt in my own mind if this reservoir, or all proposed reservoirs, would have materially alleviated the results of the 1951 flood.

Not one independent survey has ever recommended the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. In 1951 three independent consulting engineers were employed by the State of Kansas to resurvey this dam. The engineers concluded that the project was not economically feasible as a flood-control project. The Missouri Valley Survey Committee, appointed by President Truman, expressed grave doubt relative to the economic justification.

As you no doubt know from the hearings conducted last session of Congress, the Kansas State Legislature in 1953 passed a resolution requesting that no further funds be appropriated for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. This resolution still stands.

Water conservation and water shortage have always been a topic in this controversy. I want to again emphasize that we are not opposing water conservation, nor are we attempting to say that water shortage is not a matter of serious consideration. On our watersheds we have provided storage for 513,690,012 cubic feet of water, and this was done before the passage of the Hope-Aiken bill by the 83d Congress. The operation of this bill has implemented the storage of water in northeast Kansas, and H. R. 8750, passed by the House, will greatly accelerate upstream water conservation, as it liberalizes the authority of the Department of Agriculture in the cost sharing of upstream water conservation works.

In my district is the only such proposed concentration of dams that I know of in the whole Missouri River Basin. Rainfall cannot be the deciding factor as the rainfall is heavier east of the Missouri and virtually no projects proposed there. It is planned to keep the Missouri River controlled without reservoirs from South Dakota to its junction with the Mississippi at St. Louis, but the Kansas River draining a smaller watershed must be controlled by reservoirs only a few miles from its confluence with the Missouri.



In other words, it appears to me that my district has been designed as expendable for downstream benefits without any cost to them or any negative factor on their economy. I think if they were assessed for a proportion of the cost, their urgent support for these reservoirs would materially diminish.

Since President Eisenhower took this item out of the proposed budget in 1953, omitted it from the budget in 1954, and again in 1955, and no appropriation was made until the public works bill came out of the Appropriations Committee in June of last year, this project is historically and still is today a creature of a Democratic controlled Congress. If it is not, my amendment will be adopted and this item deleted from this bill today. If my amendment is not adopted, you—Democrats—are giving your tacit sanction to the project and are taking full responsibility for it, as your party controls the important Appropriations Committee recommending this project and are in control of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, on one thing; namely, that there should be more equitable treatment given to many of these people who are displaced by these flood-control projects, particularly those businessmen who do not get what they should. I disagree with him, of course, upon the value of Tuttle Creek and its necessity. General Potter, district engineer, who is now going to be the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, no more than 72 hours ago stated that the Tuttle Creek Reservoir was a key project in all flood control in the Kansas River Valley. Construction is already well underway. However, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this hour in the evening to impose upon the House again to relate the tragic events of Black Friday, July 13, 1951, which was the darkest day in the history of my hometown of Kansas City, Kans. I have told the story repeatedly here on the House floor and before congressional committees.

Congress has spoken out favoring Tuttle Creek Reservoir on numerous occasions.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not like to take the time of the Committee, but I would like to take this opportunity to say that I join with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in strong opposition to the amendment to strike funds for the continuation of the construction of this most important dam.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. I also wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas in opposition to striking out this fund. I might say that at the time of the flood of 1951 I was chairman of the subcommittee that went out there. Our

unanimous recommendation was for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam. The subcommittee's report was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations. Tuttle Creek is a vital link in the flood-control program. I certainly hope the work will continue.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk about the churches, schools, homes and farms that this reservoir will displace. Let me tell you this, that these floods on the Kansas River come frequently, almost every year, except that for the last 3 or 4 years we have not had one. Some day we are going to wake up and find a gully-washer, a frog-strangler coming down that stream, that is going to again raise havoc.

We have lost fertile fields even more fertile than those in the Blue Valley, we have lost factories, we have lost more homes, we have lost more schools, we have lost more churches in these floods than those in the Tuttle Creek area but nobody compensates us; we must rebuild, and redo, and restore at our own cost. Every person to whom Mr. AVERY has referred will be adequately compensated for all the loss they sustained, with the exception, as he pointed out, of some merchants.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the point the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has brought out about reimbursement in proper value is certainly one that Congress should look into, but not in this particular bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree there are some inequities that should be corrected, and I trust such legislation will be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement this week by Dr. Rusk on foreign aid before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Dr. Rusk is the recognized authority in prosthetic rehabilitation both in this country and abroad. He is not only one of the distinguished physicians of his time but is a writer and author of note and serves on the staff of the New York Times.

FORMAL STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1956

My name is Howard A. Rusk. I am a physician and chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; associate editor, the New York Times; consultant in Rehabilitation to the United Nations, and president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. I am appearing before you today as a private citizen

whose primary interest is the rehabilitation of the disabled.

It is my belief that rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach the minds and the hearts of men. It is natural for all of us to take improved agriculture industry and utilities for granted but men often regard these developments as somewhat remote from their immediate problems. Rehabilitation, however, makes a personal and significant impact not only upon the disabled person himself and his family but on those with whom he comes in contact. This as well as all international activities in the field of health are one aspect of our foreign assistance program which meets all yardsticks of economic soundness, simple humanitarianism and political expediency.

In his report to the Congress on our mutual security program covering July-December 1955, John Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, wrote: "The people of the United States recognize the value—economic, social, and moral—of health and the fact that health is a common need. We are also coming to recognize the vital relationship of health programs to any hopes we may have of helping to create conditions of economic progress, political stability, and democratic social development in the many areas of the world outside the United States, where our future national security is deeply involved."

Mr. Hollister then cited estimates from competent authorities that until recently the economic loss from malaria alone in India was \$224 million a year, from bilharziasis in Egypt \$57 million a year, from malaria and tuberculosis in the Philippines \$660 million a year. Also, that we in the United States pay a hidden 5 percent additional cost for our imports from malarious countries because of disease-affection production.

It is, therefore, surprising that our contribution to bilateral health programs was reduced from \$43 million in the 1955 fiscal year to \$33,767,000 in fiscal year 1956, and that of this amount less than \$50,000 was spent on all types of rehabilitation services throughout the world.

From the economic aspects alone, it would seem logical that our investment in international health would be increased rather than decreased. Over and beyond the economic implications, there are great social, moral, and political values in our support of international health activities.

These values are well illustrated by international activities in the field of rehabilitation. In this country and in the other developed parts of the world we have seen a remarkable growth of interest in rehabilitation in the last decade. This interest has not been prompted by humanitarian motives alone. It has resulted from the growing incidence of physical disability resulting from prolongation of the life span, increased public assistance costs because of disability, and our need for manpower in our expanding economy.

But what lies behind the interest of Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, India, Burma, and Thailand in the provision of rehabilitation services for their handicapped? It is not the need for manpower, for these nations have far more manpower than they can profitably utilize in their present stage of industrial development. It is not to reduce public assistance costs, for few of these nations have any social schemes whereby the disabled become a responsibility of the state. It is not to reduce demands for medical, hospitalization, and social services, for the chronically ill and disabled in most of these nations are wards of their families rather than of the state.

The real reason is that many of these nations, particularly those of the Africa-Asia

area, have, after years of colonization, recently achieved the long-sought dream of political independence. Now they are desperately looking for ways of proving to the world, and more importantly to themselves, that they have the political and social maturity to justify their political independence.

Long before the Government became concerned with international health projects, the Rockefeller Foundation, W. B. Kellogg Foundation, China Medical Board, and other private groups had years of experience in the administration of such programs. As a result, we have more know-how in the conduct of international health projects than in some other forms of technical assistance and are able to administer such projects more effectively.

Health projects are welcomed by the nations in which they are undertaken, for such projects are initiated only at the request of host countries. They are cooperative projects involving both joint planning and administration.

Host countries furnish a part, frequently the major part, of the funds for such projects. The \$6 million contributed in 1955 to joint health projects in Latin America by the United States was expanded by \$19 million.

Since our Federal technical cooperation health programs, known popularly as point 4 projects, began more than 13 years ago, they have cost our citizens less than a penny a month a person.

It is reported that last year Russia graduated 27,000 physicians from their medical schools and 20,000 the previous year. At the present time we are graduating slightly more than 7,000 in the United States per year. It is granted that the level of education of these physicians is far below that of our physicians, but, even so, the health services they are providing to the country are so superior to those ever before available to the people to them it is considered a miracle.

It has also been reported that at the present time there are more doctors than can be readily absorbed in the health services of Russia, and the physicians are being used for the kind of job that we would ordinarily assign to nurses and technicians. If the production continues and the excess increases, it is rather obvious what the physicians will do. They will carry the skills they have learned along with the concepts of communism to the backward parts of the world. We must meet this challenge, and we can, for our physicians are better trained. By using total professional personnel, therapists, sanitary engineers, public-health administrators, and educators we can do a better job. But time is running out.

Here is one example of what could be done. The Veterans' Administration has, since 1946, conducted an extensive artificial-limb research program which is carried out by nonprofit contracts with universities. The Army and Navy cooperate by supporting prosthetic-research laboratories within their medical services. Work in the universities and armed services has been coordinated by the Prosthetics Research Board (formerly the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs) of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council under a contract between the Veterans' Administration and the Academy.

The need for a research program in artificial limbs became apparent early in 1945 when, at the request of the Surgeon General of the Army, the National Research Council brought together a group of scientists, engineers, surgeons, and prosthetists for the purpose of establishing standards for procurement of prostheses. At this meeting it was soon learned that the development of artificial limbs had proceeded through the years without the benefit of a scientific approach, whereupon it was recommended that the Government support a research program in this field.

As the result of this program our own disabled veterans have prosthetic devices far superior to those found anywhere else in the world.

Just as we are interested in sharing the technical advances in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the rest of the world, we could make a significant contribution to the effective understanding of American ideals of democracy and the value we place on human worth and dignity, if through an appropriation of one or two million dollars a year we could share our advances in artificial limbs with the world. Through demonstration centers, consultants, mobile clinics, and the training of foreign personnel in the United States, a magnificent program could be established. With the sum of \$1 million a year for 2 years both the administrative and professional overhead cost of such a project could be met; highly qualified American consultants could visit all parts of the world and survey what is available and what is needed; 4 completely equipped mobile prosthetic shops, each staffed by a qualified American prosthetic technician and physical therapist, could be sent to southeast Asia, the Near East, north Africa, and South America to spend 4 to 8 weeks in a given community rendering direct patient services in fitting prosthetics and training wearers in their use; permanent demonstration prosthetic shops and training centers could be established in key parts of the world; and the components to provide modern artificial limbs could be made available to over 40,000 amputees; over 100 trainees could be brought to the United States for training in prosthetics; and all of the available technical literature and visual aids in prosthetics here in the United States could be translated and published in various languages for international distribution.

These prosthetic trainees would then join the 400 health workers receiving advanced training in the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. They and hundreds of others trained under the auspices of private foundations, their own governments and their own resources, are permanent ambassadors of our democratic ideals. Such persons make particularly effective proponents for democracy because as professional people they work intimately with their handicapped patients and have their confidence and trust.

Somewhere within the spectrum ranging from direct relief to long-range economic projects, there is a need for significant, tangible short-range projects that can be seen and easily understood. The Russians produced such a project when they paved the main street of Kabul in Afghanistan. Our foreign-aid projects there have been of economic importance, but their impact on the daily lives of the people will not be felt for many years. In contrast, several times each day the residents of Kabul have reason to be grateful to Russia.

This is the kind of an imaginative, constructive project which can be easily seen and understood. There are many hundreds and thousands of disabled persons throughout the world, each of whom could also become a living, dynamic example of American democracy. To illustrate their potential contributions, I should like to tell you the story of a little Bolivian boy, age 10. He was born without arms and legs with 4 little, sensitive fingers coming out of each shoulder and 2 normal feet coming from the hip joint but with no bony connection. When he was a year old, he was abandoned by his father, who then deserted the family and has not been heard of since. The boy spent the next 8 years of his life in an American mission in La Paz, where he had love and kindness but could not walk. To get from one place to another, he rolled like a little ball. He was seen there by a young physician from the United States who called me and said he had met this little boy, who was exceedingly bright and who, if he had a chance, he felt,

could be a great force in the world. Pictures and case reports were sent and by coincidence seen by the secretary of one of our distinguished citizens. She made possible his trip to the United States.

Two weeks before he arrived, I had the Vice President of Bolivia and the Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations for luncheon. They knew all about Juanito and were excited about his coming. In the middle of the meal, I said to them, "You know, if we bring Juan here it is going to cost you a very large fee."

In consternation, they said, "How much?" I said, "The fee is this. First, that when he returns, you must promise him the best education your country affords; and second, if we can demonstrate in the most severely disabled child you will ever see what can be done, you will establish a national rehabilitation program in Bolivia."

Without hesitation, the Vice President said, "You take the boy; we pay the fee."

When he arrived, he spoke no English. Within a month, he had a vocabulary of more than 300 words. Special prostheses were designed and he now is walking. He has grown more than twice his height. He is doing well in school and one day soon will be ready to go back and take his place in his own country.

Several months after he was in the United States, the story was published in a national magazine. A few weeks later, a letter came to the editors, which read as follows:

"Congratulations on a brilliant piece of reporting. Am referring to your (February 21) on Juanito Yeppez, the congenital quadruple amputee from Bolivia. \* \* \* For those of us who are in and out of Central and South America we found your article on Juanito gained us more friends (and respect) than all the millions our government is pouring into these countries. We noted no sudden pro United States of America feeling in Brazil as a result of the \$75 million donation (given Brazil by the United States), but we were pleasantly surprised with the many compliments for what the United States of America is doing for Juanito. I do not know what your circulation is in Latin America but can tell you the peons in the backwoods knew all about Juanito within 24 hours after the issue was on the streets. \* \* \*

"E. E. BUTLER, Master.

"TAMPICO, MEXICO."

What we need in the United States are friends like Juanito Yeppez all over the world, with the recognition that in the United States we believe in the dignity of the individual and because of that belief want to share the things that we have learned in our country. We are not doing this to make friends—we are doing this to give service. If the service and the spirit are there, then we can't help but have their friendship.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

M'GEE BEND DAM

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a few minutes at this point to outline briefly some pertinent facts about the McGee Bend Dam project in east Texas. An appropriation of \$4 million is proposed in this public-works bill so that orderly and economical construction can be carried on in the next fiscal year.

There is no other single project in the entire Second Congressional District that is more important to the welfare of this country and to the people of east Texas



than McGee Bend Dam. This dam—a multipurpose project to be located on the Angelina River—was authorized by Congress in 1945 to be the major part of a two-dam system to efficiently control the fresh-water resources of both the Angelina and Neches Rivers. A smaller reregulating dam was authorized to complete the system.

Public hearings were held in November 1945 at Jasper, Tex.—just 10 miles from the actual dam site—and the overwhelming majority of people from every part of the area went on record in favor of the project to provide the entire watershed with adequate flood control, additional electric power, vital fresh-water storage, and, of course, the untold benefits from recreation that a project of this type will offer.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated this project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.39 to 1, and the vast majority of people in east Texas—both Democrats and Republicans—have continued to support McGee Bend Dam, and they are supporting it now.

During the Korean emergency, the United States Army engineers stated before the House Appropriations Committee that McGee Bend Dam was one of the nine most necessary projects for the Nation's defense and essential civilian economy and the engineers urged the rapid completion of planning so that construction could start.

The smaller reregulating dam was completed in 1951 and last year \$1.5 million in initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam was put in the public works appropriations bill in the House committee. This action was taken after the Federal Government had received assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority that a total of \$15 million would be contributed to the overall authorized project by this local State agency. Congress approved the \$1.5 million and the President signed the bill.

This year the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the \$4 million appropriation now pending before us be included in the budget so that orderly and economical construction of the project could be carried on during the next fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget has approved clearance for the Engineers to begin work on McGee Bend Dam immediately.

Members of the House, McGee Bend Dam is not a new project. It was taken under study more than 10 years ago and since that time a great deal of money from both local agency and the Federal Government has been spent toward completion of this critically needed project. I would respectfully ask that the House consider these facts about McGee Bend Dam as we vote on the public works appropriation bill:

First. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the Congress have approved the completion of McGee Bend Dam as authorized.

Second. Initial construction money has already been appropriated by the Congress and this money is being obligated by the Government at this time.

Third. In spite of the opposition from a handful of timber and paper mill in-

terests, the overwhelming majority of the people in east Texas—representing industry, labor, small-business men, county and city officials, chambers of commerce and civic leaders throughout the area are solidly behind this effort to preserve the precious fresh water resources of our country.

In 1946 Congress appropriated money to begin work on the smaller reregulating dam after receiving assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority—a nontaxing, nonprofit, State agency—of local contributions totaling \$5 million for the overall, authorized project. The smaller dam was completed in 1951 and the LNVA paid the Federal Government \$2 million in cash. In the meantime, initial planning money for the larger, multipurpose dam had been appropriated.

The Neches-Angelina watershed is the sole fresh water supply of the giant petro-chemical industry in Jefferson County, Tex. We have five of the world's major oil refineries, synthetic rubber plants, and many other vital defense industries depending on a guaranteed annual supply of fresh water—and our defense program is depending on these industries being able to produce at full capacity at a moment's notice.

While we are considering this project, the low streamflows of the Neches and Angelina Rivers are allowing salt water to back upstream toward the water intakes of these refineries and the city of Port Arthur. If salt water reaches these intakes the entire production would be shut down. These refineries produce 700,000 barrels of oil per day and since the approval by Congress of initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam, \$100 million in expansion of these industries has been authorized by their owners. And it is interesting to note that we pay \$80 million per year in excise taxes on petroleum products alone in Jefferson County.

There is opposition to McGee Bend Dam from a handful of timber interests who would stifle and hamstring the future of a half million people in this great east Texas area. After 10 years of public hearings and study by Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers, this tiny but powerful group has suddenly at this late date proposed an alternate plan for McGee Bend Dam that would reduce the size of the project and take the authorized powerplant completely out. This plan is strangely similar to one which the Public Works Committee held hearings on in 1954 and has already been set aside by the Corps of Engineers, set aside by the Bureau of the Budget, and set aside by the Congress.

While these powerful interests are attacking the inclusion of power in this authorized project, let's look briefly at the facts. The Federal Government has already received two bids for the electric power to be generated at McGee Bend Dam, each of which will more than pay for the incremental cost of installing a powerplant in the dam. If that is not a clear-cut case pointing out the need of additional electric power in east Texas, I would like to hear one. These people have their money on the line.

And I think it is only fair to bring to the attention of the House that both the REA co-ops and the private utilities in east Texas and southwest Louisiana are both cooperating in 100 percent support for McGee Bend Dam with power included.

I believe you would agree with me that it would be unthinkable to break faith with us in east Texas after beginning this vital project, having the reregulating dam already completed, and having appropriated initial construction money last year. The petro-chemical industries, side by side with the smaller communities upstream, are waiting for sufficient fresh water so the rich natural resources which surround them can be developed to their maximum degree. It takes 40,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of paper. It takes 18 barrels of fresh water to refine a barrel of oil. We must have more fresh water.

These communities, as they grow, need fresh water and electricity for their homes and businesses. If we fail to keep faith with these people now we will be locking the door on the future of 500,000 people living in the Second Congressional District.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill includes among the general construction items, as listed on page 13 of the committee report, the sum of \$500,000 for construction on the Kalamazoo River flood-control project at Battle Creek, Mich.

This item, which has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and which was included in the President's budget, is the initial request for actual construction funds for a project which had its inception in 1947 with original authorization of engineering studies. The project itself was authorized by Congress in 1954 in substantial measure as a result of the efforts of my able and distinguished predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer.

The project, involving a total estimated cost of \$7,741,000, has a cost-benefit ratio of 1 to 1.58, and also an unusually high local participation of 40 percent. One striking evidence of the high degree of local interest and support is a recent outright gift to the city of Battle Creek by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of \$400,000 to permit expediting necessary land acquisitions for flood control. The city of Battle Creek last year also advanced \$125,000 to the Corps of Engineers with the approval of the Secretary of the Army to make the definite project studies.

Besides assuring relief from a dangerous flood hazard in this major city in my district, this program—and the \$500,000 appropriation included in this bill—triggers a \$25 to \$30 million master plan for Battle Creek, encompassing consolidation of two major railroads within the city, elimination of grade crossings, highway improvements and extension, slum clearance, and parking-area developments, all of which hold tremendous import for the future of this community.

I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge the excellent cooperation of the Department of the Army, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and particularly the House Committees on Public Works and Appropriations in bringing this project to this present advanced stage. Particularly I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairmen of these two committees; to the ranking minority members of the committees, Mr. DONDERO and Mr. TABER; to Mr. MACK of Washington, former Public Works Subcommittee chairman; to Mr. RABAUT, present chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and to Mr. MARSHALL, of the same subcommittee; and to my colleague from Michigan, Mr. FORD, for this assistance and cooperation.

A genuinely bipartisan interest in the public welfare and in the benefits to be gained by this community and my district has made possible expediting this legislation for the protection and improvement of Battle Creek.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, construction of the important Warrior lock and dam, located in the district which I have the privilege to represent, was begun in the fall of 1954 with an initial appropriation of \$1,800,000. Congress approved an additional \$4,100,000 last year, and I am informed that construction is progressing on schedule. The Corps of Engineers has indicated that \$4,580,000 will be required during the coming fiscal year if the lock is to be completed on schedule.

The Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the House Appropriations Committee have approved the \$4,580,000, and that amount is included in the bill under consideration by the House of Representatives today.

The Warrior lock and dam is a modern navigation structure that will replace two 50-year-old installations which are now dilapidated, obsolete, and in danger of partial, if not complete, failure. In fact, the present structures are in such condition that they pose serious danger not only to navigation but to the safety of the persons operating towboats and barges on the river. The importance of completing the new structures at the earliest possible date cannot be over-emphasized.

The great majority of the people of my district favor the construction of the Warrior lock and dam. The towboat and barge operators, as well as the shippers of commerce on the river, regard the completion of this installation as urgent. The people of the State as a whole recognize the need for it, and in their behalf I earnestly urge the members of this body to approve the full amount of \$4,580,000, already in the bill under consideration, so that the orderly construction of the Warrior lock and dam may continue on schedule.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this appropriation bill as it contains, among many other things, an item for general construction, under the Corps of Engineers, in the amount of \$421,684,000. Within this figure, the committee has recommended the amount of \$6 million

for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River, from Philadelphia to Trenton.

The district in Philadelphia which I represent borders on the Delaware River from South Street to Frankford Creek. This area is highly industrialized, but its further growth is stymied until an adequate waterway from Philadelphia to Trenton is a reality. Such development will mean more than prestige and monetary return to the city of Philadelphia. It will have far-reaching consequences which will affect the people of the whole country. Consider its strategic value as a bulwark of our national-security program. The tidal reach of the Delaware River at no point between Delaware City and Trenton is closer to the shore than 40 miles. Thus, it enjoys a nominal and natural security in the event of hostile action against our country. It provides a natural fortress for the loading of supplies and the embarkation of personnel. Our military and naval installations, including the Philadelphia Naval Base at the lower end of the Delaware, and the Frankford Arsenal toward the upper end, will be less accessible to enemy attack. Further, the Delaware Valley is centrally located within the northeast industrial quadrant, the vital heart of the Nation's productive capacity.

One of the most important results of this channel project will be an increase in employment. Many of my constituents reside along or near the waterfront and a great number of them make their livelihood in the shipping industry. At the present time, there are a great number of seamen in this area who cannot get employment. With the increase in foreign and domestic trade which is sure to follow the deepening of the channel in the Delaware River, these men will have much better opportunities for employment.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I note by the report that this bill includes \$205,000 in planning money for the Carlyle, (Ill.) Reservoir. I am not opposing this appropriation as I feel that it is time to proceed on the Kaskaskia River Valley Basin as this is one of the most important rivers in the State of Illinois. Furthermore, I have no objection to the Carlyle Reservoir as such, but I do feel constrained to report to the House that the Corps of Engineers has been working on a supplemental survey report which is scheduled to be approved later this year. This report recommends that two reservoirs be constructed on the Kaskaskia River. One at Shelbyville, Ill., and the other at Carlyle, Ill. This report was referred to by General Hardin in the hearings when he said:

Mr. Chairman, this project is associated with a review of the Kaskaskia Basin, and the Kaskaskia Basin report has not been completed.

As an interim measure the Carlyle Reservoir, of course, being an adopted project and having planning funds on it, has been carefully reviewed in conjunction with the Kaskaskia Basin report, and some modifications in the Carlyle Reservoir have been felt to be advisable on account of the overall basin problems which this Kaskaskia report has made obvious.

I realize that the Shelbyville Reservoir cannot be included in an appropriation

bill until it has been authorized by law, but I do believe it should be called to the attention of the committee at this time since it appears that the Shelbyville Reservoir will be more than justified by the Kaskaskia River Basin report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this report by the Corps of Engineers is approved at an early date so that the authorization can be expanded to include authorization of a dam and reservoir on the Kaskaskia River at Shelbyville, Ill., in accordance with this report now being completed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment the committee for their long and arduous work incident to the presentation of this bill and urge your approval of the appropriations herein for power, reclamation, flood control and flood relief projects that will, when achieved, undoubtedly promote the national welfare.

All of the items and provisions of this bill are, of course, important, and it would be indeed difficult to place one before another. However, the appropriations recommended under the civil functions section, which includes flood-control and flood-protection projects within my area and the Nation, are, in my judgment, of paramount value to the country.

Flood control and protection has, indeed, these past several years become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem is great. The imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control has been projected to the height of national and congressional consciousness because of the extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the ruinous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country and particularly in New England.

Right here I would like to take but a moment to most sincerely thank the chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of my own people and I am sure the people of the country, for devoting so much of personal and committee time, well beyond the usual hours, to patiently and earnestly study this flood disaster subject in order to conscientiously recommend the appropriation of sufficient Federal money to grant financial help where it is most needed. It is a trying and difficult job as we, your colleagues, well know, and you have been and are now discharging your obligation in an inspiring manner.

You and I, and all our colleagues here, are, of course, sympathetic with the representatives and to the people of all sections of the country whose homes and industries, and in too many tragic instances lives, have been lost through the sudden eruption of uncontrolled natural elements. Quite naturally and humanly, we are, of course, primarily concerned with the problems and difficulties following these disasters within our own areas and States. Within these past 3 years Massachusetts and New England have been visited in quick succession with an unprecedented series of unparalleled



natural disasters. First it was tornadoes, after which came hurricanes, then raging floods, and finally, 3 of the greatest blizzards in our history within 10 days. Hundreds of families lost loved ones, many businesses were almost wholly wiped out, and thousands of persons thrown out of work for periods of several months. In our area we suffered most particularly and severely from the raging floods. The people and the businesses in the area of my home city of Worcester, Mass., underwent tremendous personal hardships and great financial losses because of the repeated floodings and inadequate control barriers during extraordinarily heavy rainfall and excessive downward flow from upland rivers.

It is most encouraging and heartening, then, to these American taxpayers to realize that some steps are being initiated by the Federal Government to assist them in the construction of projects designed to prevent such terrible disasters from again happening.

In my particular city, the most efficient Corps of Engineers had long recognized the vital necessity of a flood-protection tunnel and they recommended the participation of the Federal Government in the achievement of such a project for local protection. Last January 18 I appeared before the committee to present a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this particular project for the safety of the people of my city and area, and there was then approved in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a sum of \$60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of this Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project. I am not, of course, going to repetitiously recite these details again or unnecessarily intrude upon the time of this House, as all my testimony is contained in the printed hearings, available to you and, of course, to the committee.

It was a matter of modest personal gratification to me that the committee approved the initial resurvey sum and further recommended in this present bill the additional sum of \$840,000 to begin construction of the tunnel in this next fiscal year. The engineers testified that this project is of superior justification economically because the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is high above the average that is required. That is the criterion that has been applied by the committee as the basis for recommending the projects contained in this bill, and that is why I earnestly urge the unanimous approval of the bill by this House so that projects of imperative importance, such as the Worcester diversionary tunnel in my area, and similar projects throughout the country, may soon have a beginning, primarily in protection of the lives of American citizens.

To extend Federal aid in this manner for this purpose is not contrary to any congressional tradition or precedent. In my sincere judgment, the whole history of congressional action in relation to water control and waterpower impressively reveals the continuing legislative conviction and intent that our water

resources should be developed and controlled in a manner to assure their great contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water-control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size, complexity, or potential multiple benefits, are beyond the means of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England and national water-control problem lies; and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has granted in the past and will soon be called upon again to consider the granting of billions of dollars to assist and encourage the desperate people in foreign lands all over the world. Such reasonable and controlled assistance is certainly a Christian gesture, and in accord with what the American taxpayer can reasonably afford, it is at least a gamble on the side of the Almighty.

However, I submit that the willing, patriotic and burdened taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government, and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs for construction of such flood control projects as the Worcester, Mass., tunnel and other projects throughout New England and the Nation are not provided for through adequate Federal assistance and participation before such disaster strikes again. For the saving of countless American lives, for the prevention of untold economic loss, for the certain promotion of the national welfare, I earnestly urge the adoption and approval of this bill without further delay.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to include as part of my remarks on the pending legislation the statement I prepared for the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Army during hearings conducted on flood-control projects:

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS  
BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: you have already received the necessary factual information concerning the flood control needs in my congressional district. The purpose of my statement is to emphasize the fact that this fast growing area needs special attention at this time. I particularly wish to emphasize the West Covina situation where recent heavy rains cause considerable hardship on thousands of new residents of that area. I wish to include a resolution passed by the West Covina City Council in this regard. The resolution is attached.

I urge that this committee visit my congressional district and survey the flood hazards in person. It is difficult for those in

other parts of the country to realize what tremendous growth has taken place in the eastern section of Los Angeles County. I am convinced that if the members of this committee could see the need at first hand, quick approval for full and complete flood protection would be authorized.

I wish to thank the committee for the assistance you have given the people of my congressional district in the past, particularly in the completion of San Antonio and Whittier Narrows Dams. These dams, together with flood control channels now under construction, will help to make it possible for nearly 500,000 people in California's 25th Congressional District to live, work and plan their futures without fear of disastrous floods.

#### "Resolution No. 750

"Resolution of the City Council of the City of West Covina, county of Los Angeles, State of California, requesting the Congress of the United States to budget the necessary funds for the immediate construction of Walnut Creek system of the comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters in the said county of Los Angeles, Calif.

"The City Council of the City of West Covina does resolve as follows:

#### "SECTION 1—

"Whereas the cities of the East San Gabriel Valley and various interested civic groups have studied the comprehensive plan for the control and conservation of floodwaters in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; and

"Whereas the Whittier Narrows Reservoir Basin will be completed this year; and

"Whereas the entire East San Gabriel Valley is now developing as a metropolitan community at a phenomenal rate; and

"Whereas the present washes are entirely inadequate to discharge the runoff from capital storms and are thus endangering human lives and property; and

"Whereas a comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters for the county of Los Angeles was approved and authorized by the Congress of the United States in 1941; and

"Whereas the Walnut Creek system is a portion of said comprehensive plan and the early improvement thereof is vital to the safety of the East San Gabriel Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of the Walnut Creek system of said comprehensive plan at the next regular session of said Congress.

"Sec. 2. The city clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution."

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at an adjourned regular meeting of the City Council of the City of West Covina, held on the 5th day of July 1955, by the affirmative vote of at least three councilmen, to wit:

"Ayes: Councilmen Kay, Van Horn, Brown, Sperline.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: Mayor Hurst.

"ROBERT FLOTTEN,  
City Clerk of the City of West Covina.

"Signed and approved this 5th day of July 1955.

"JOE HURST,  
Mayor of the City of West Covina.

"Attest:  
"ROBERT FLOTTEN, City Clerk."

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be

agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Abernethy amendment on page 15, line 16; and I ask for a separate vote on the Boggs amendment, page 16, line 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "\$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,122,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 170, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—179

Abblitt	Chelf	Friedel
Abernethy	Chudoff	Garmatz
Addonizio	Clark	Gary
Albert	Colmer	Gathings
Alexander	Cooper	Gordon
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Anfuso	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Ashley	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Ashmore	Dempsey	Griffiths
Aspinall	Denton	Hagen
Bailey	Dies	Hardy
Baldwin	Dodd	Harris
Barrett	Dollinger	Harrison, Va.
Bass, Tenn.	Donohue	Hays, Ark.
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, S. C.	Hayworth
Blatnik	Dowdy	Healey
Blitch	Edmondson	Hébert
Boggs	Elliott	Herlong
Bolling	Evins	Hollfield
Bonner	Fallon	Holland
Boykin	Feighan	Holtzman
Boyle	Fernandez	Huddleston
Brooks, La.	Fisher	Hull
Brooks, Tex.	Flood	Ikard
Brown, Ga.	Flynt	Jarman
Burleson	Foran	Jennings
Burnside	Forand	Johnson, Wis.
Byrne, Pa.	Forrester	Jones, Ala.
Cannon	Fountain	Jones, Mo.
Carnahan	Frazier	Karsten

Kee	Murray, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.
Kelly, Pa.	Murray, Tenn.	Rooney
Kelly, N. Y.	Natcher	Rutherford
Keogh	Norrell	Selden
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Shelley
Kilgore	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sisk
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Kirwan	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Klein	Perkins	Spence
Kluczynski	Pfost	Staggers
Knutson	Philbin	Sullivan
Lanham	Pilcher	Thomas
Lankford	Poage	Thompson, N. J.
Lesinski	Polk	Thompson, Tex.
Long	Powell	Trimble
McCormack	Preston	Tuck
McDowell	Price	Tumulty
McMillan	Priest	Udall
Machrowicz	Rabaut	Vanik
Mack, Ill.	Rains	Walter
Madden	Reuss	Whitten
Magnuson	Rhodes, Pa.	Wickersham
Mahon	Richards	Wier
Metcalf	Riley	Williams, Miss.
Mills	Rivers	Williams, N. J.
Mollohan	Roberts	Willis
Morgan	Robeson, Va.	Yates
Moss	Rodino	Zablocki
Moulder	Rogers, Colo.	Zelenko
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	

NAYS—170

Alger	Fenton	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Norblad
Andersen,	Fulton	O'Konski
H. Carl	Gavin	Ostertag
Andresen,	Gentry	Patterson
August H.	George	Pelly
Auchincloss	Gross	Phillips
Avery	Hale	Pillion
Ayres	Halleck	Poff
Baker	Hand	Prouty
Bass, N. H.	Harden	Radwan
Bates	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Baumhart	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Becker	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Riehlman
Bentley	Hillings	Rogers, Mass.
Betts	Hinshaw	Sadiak
Boland	Hoeven	St. George
Bolton,	Holmes	Saylor
Frances P.	Horan	Schenck
Bosch	Hosmer	Schwengel
Bow	Hyde	Scott
Bray	Jackson	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	James	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Jenkins	Short
Broyhill	Jensen	Siler
Budge	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Burdick	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Bush	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Canfield	Keating	Springer
Carrigg	Kilburn	Taber
Cederberg	King, Pa.	Talle
Chase	Knox	Taylor
Chenoweth	Krueger	Teague, Calif.
Chiperfield	Laird	Thompson,
Church	Latham	Mich.
Clevenger	LeCompte	Thomson, Wyo.
Cole	Lipecomb	Tollefson
Coon	Lovre	Utt
Corbett	McConnell	Van Pelt
Coudert	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Cramer	McDonough	Vorys
Cretella	McGregor	Vursell
Cunningham	McIntire	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass.	McVey	Weaver
Curtis, Mo.	Marshall	Wharton
Dague	Martin	Widnall
Davis, Wis.	Meador	Wigglesworth
Dawson, Utah	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Devereux	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Dixon	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Dondoro	Minshall	Wolverton
Dorn, N. Y.	Morano	Young
Ellsworth	Mumma	Younger

NOT VOTING—84

Adair	Chatham	Eberharter
Allen, Calif.	Christopher	Engle
Arends	Cooley	Fascell
Barden	Crumpacker	Fino
Bell	Davidson	Fjare
Berry	Dawson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen
Bolton,	Deane	Gamble
Oliver P.	Diggs	Granahan
Bowler	Dingell	Green, Pa.
Buckley	Dolliver	Gregory
Byrd	Donovan	Gubser
Carlyle	Doyle	Gwinn
Celler	Durham	Haley

Hays, Ohio	Mason	Shuford
Henderson	Matthews	Sieminski
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hoffman, Mich.	Morrison	Steed
Holt	Nelson	Teague, Tex.
Hope	O'Hara, Minn.	Thompson, La.
Johnson, Calif.	Osmer	Thornberry
Jonas	Passman	Velde
Judd	Patman	Vinson
Kearns	Quigley	Watts
Landrum	Robison, Ky.	Westland
Lane	Roosevelt	Wilson, Calif.
McCarthy	Scherer	Winstead
Macdonald	Scudder	Wright
Mack, Wash.	Sheehan	
Maillard	Sheppard	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Arends against.  
Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.  
Mr. Fascell for with Mr. Kearns against.  
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Fjare against.  
Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Dolliver against.  
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Sheehan against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.  
Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Adair against.  
Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Henderson against.  
Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Mason against.  
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Osmer against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.  
Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Gwinn against.  
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Allen of California against.  
Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Scherer against.  
Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Westland against.  
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Maillard against.  
Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Mack of Washington against.  
Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Fino against.  
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gamble against.  
Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Holt against.  
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Judd against.  
Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Berry against.  
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Velde against.  
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.  
Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Hope against.  
Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Gubser against.  
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Crumpacker against.  
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Nelson against.  
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Passman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.  
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.  
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.  
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALBERT, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. O'HARA of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 4, strike out "\$421,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$422,034,000 of which \$300,000 shall be for the project Missouri River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.



The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 174, noes 148. So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for more careful and responsible consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) entitled "An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956."

#### A DAY OF DESTINY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of destiny for the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Today, the House has reaffirmed the faith which it expressed last year in the great multipurpose plan for development and navigation of the Arkansas River.

For the first time during my service in the House, the great House Committee on Appropriations has initiated appropriations for three major projects in this plan: Oologah Dam, on the Verdigris River, Eufaula Dam, on the Canadian River, and Dardanelle Dam, on the Arkansas River.

Although the funds provided for each of these projects are modest and below requests of the Army engineers, they serve the significant purpose of continuing construction—and they provide an unmistakable green light by this body to the Army engineers, to go ahead with the great plan for the Arkansas Valley which has been authorized since 1946.

Although the overall cost of this program is substantial, its benefits are likewise substantial, from the national point of view.

Engineering estimates in 1955 have placed the annual benefits of the multipurpose program at more than \$60 million. Estimated annual tonnage is in excess of 13 million tons, and there are great resources of coal, oil and other minerals awaiting development when the benefits of water freight become available.

There has been some comment today on the floor about the difference between navigation development on so-called "main stems" and "lesser streams."

Let no one question the right of the Arkansas River to classification as a "main stem." It is the greatest undeveloped water artery in the United States, and is recognized as such by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The estimated future tonnage of 13,000,000 tons annually compares very favorably with the 1980 estimate for the Missouri River, of 5,000,000 tons. Yet the projected cost of the Arkansas River multipurpose plan is only a small fraction of the overall cost scheduled for the Missouri River in future years.

During the 19th century the Arkansas River was a great channel of trade and commerce for our Nation, and under this plan it will become an even greater channel in the future.

Nor should the other great benefits of the program be overlooked.

In flood control alone, the program has great significance for 4,000,000 people in 2 States, who have suffered multimillion dollar floods in 21 of the last 35 years. We are going to reduce that damage substantially under this program.

We are going to provide water conservation, and a great and stable supply of water for municipal, industrial and irrigation use—in a valley where annual water waste has been calculated to cost as much as \$80,000,000.

We are going to provide opportunities for recreation, and for industrial growth, the benefits of which are impossible to calculate, but which assuredly mean the dawning of a new day in the valley of the Arkansas.

On behalf of the people of Oklahoma, who have long assisted in bearing the

great burden of navigation and multipurpose plans in other parts of our country, I want to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Appropriations for its recognition and endorsement of the Arkansas Basin program.

We are also deeply grateful to the Army engineers, whose careful restudy of the Arkansas program led to its renewed justification last year, and whose capable officers will direct the building of these great projects.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the Members of this House, for generously and fairly responding to our plea for justice in the Arkansas Basin.

With your help, we thus embark on our great undertaking, with confidence that the entire Nation will rejoice in our progress and share in the benefits of basin development under the sound plan of the Army engineers.

Once again, we extend our thanks to the farsighted Members of this House, and to the Divine Providence guiding all our thoughts and actions, for this day of destiny in the Arkansas River Valley.

#### RABBI BERMAN'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE RABBINATE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in the city of Chicago at a great banquet in the grand ballroom of the Standard Club Rabbi Morton M. Berman will be honored on the occasion of his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. It will be my privilege and my honor to be present on that memorable occasion. Rabbi Berman, whose fame is international and who is held in warmest affection among the people of Chicago of all faiths, is one of my most distinguished constituents.

I am extending my remarks to include an article in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 21, 1956, entitled "Looking Back 30 Years, Rabbi Berman Sees Peace Ahead," which I am sure all my colleagues will wish to read. The article follows:

#### LOOKING BACK 30 YEARS, RABBI BERMAN SEES PEACE AHEAD

(By Hoke Norris)

The ancestors of the salami man of Oklawaha are buried on the Mount of Olives, a quarter of a mile from the Garden of Gethsemane.

He's now the rabbi of Temple Isaiah Israel, 1100 East Hyde Park, and holds office or membership in 19 religious and civic organizations and is a past officer or member of 18.

At 56 he's a slim, vigorous, graying, 5-foot-7, 160-pound lieutenant commander in the Navy Reserve, and he's about to celebrate his 30th year as a rabbi.

Such is the mixture that makes up Rabbi Morton M. Berman, the descendant of many rabbis and Chicago's most active and articulate advocate of that Jewish homeland, Israel.

"Where do we start?" he asks a visitor bent on learning something about the man and his work.

## USES THIRD PERSON

At the beginning, the rabbi then suggests, and talks and paces for an hour or more, often lapsing into the third person, as if dictating a biography of somebody else.

"Rabbi Berman commented that his most enthusiastic recipients of kosher salami and gefüllte fish on Okinawa were the non-Jewish men."

Very well, then, at the beginning:

He was born in Baltimore, August 23, 1899. His great-grandfather was Rabbi Wolf Samuelson, of Kovno, Lithuania, and there'd always been a rabbi in the house as far back as the great-grandparents' memory and family stories reached into the past.

## ANCESTRY TRACED

Rabbi Samuelson had two daughters. Rachel married Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Berman, a native of Volozhin, Lithuania, later rabbi of the Pratt St. Synagog, Baltimore. They had a son, Morris Berman. The other daughter, Bertha, married Rabbi Jacob Aban Frommer, who had served in Riga, Latvia, and later in New Haven, Conn. He had a daughter, Rose Mary.

Morris and Rose Mary were married. They had 5 children, of whom 2, including Morton, became rabbis. Morris Berman is now a retired businessman.

The five children were raised in New Haven. Young Morton went to Yale University on a scholarship, graduating Phi Beta Kappa with his class in 1921 despite 1 year as a private in the Student Army Training Corps during World War I.

## ATTENDED SEMINARY

He spent an unhappy year at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York (it lacked, he has said, "any clear direction in its program"). Next, he came under the influence of a man who was profoundly to influence the rest of his life.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the great Zionist leader, had just founded the Jewish Institute of Religion. Morton Berman was graduated in its first class, 1926, and was ordained a rabbi. As the recipient of the institute's Guggenheimer Fellowship, he studied in Germany and France and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

He became rabbi of Temple Emanuel in Davenport, Iowa, serving until 1929. He returned then to Rabbi Wise, first as a director of the institute's field activities, later as assistant rabbi at the Free Synagog.

Hitler was rising in Germany, and would slaughter 6 million Jews before his death. Rabbi Berman helped organize the great anti-Nazi protest meetings and parades in New York.

## RECALLS EUROPE TRIP

In 1938 he went to Europe on behalf of the joint distribution committee (now part of the United Jewish Appeal). He also visited Russia. "I came away," he said, "sick at heart as I saw the rapid disappearance of Jewish communal and religious life in that land."

But he had been able to visit the old Lithuanian and Latvian synagogues where his grandfathers had been rabbis. And he went to Palestine. Arab riots had been renewed, and he was prevented from visiting the family graves on the Mount of Olives.

Great-grandfather and great-grandmother Samuelson were buried there, in a family plot, just north of the old city, and so were their ancestors and their two daughters and their rabbi husbands.

Again in 1948 and once more last summer, Rabbi Berman was unable to view the graves when he went back to what had become Israel. In 1948 the land was already occupied by Jordan Arabs, and by last summer it had become part of the Jordan kingdom.

## CONFIDENT OF PEACE

"My sense of attachment," the rabbi says, "is not just to the State of Israel but is

enriched with deep personal ties and associations. \* \* \* Some day, I hope—I am confident—that peace will come between Jordan and Israel and I may be able to make that pilgrimage."

In 1939 he got out of Europe just as the war began, and in May 1943, he became a Navy lieutenant. Eventually he was assigned as a chaplain to the 6th Marine Division, and earned one of his many titles.

He had landed with the troops on Okinawa on April 1, 1945, aged 45—one of the oldest chaplains in the Pacific. In his jeep he carried the Bible of his religion and the kosher salami and gefüllte fish that were gifts from the National Jewish Welfare Board.

In June 1945, Herman Kogan, then a Marine Corps correspondent, now Sun-Times book and drama critic, reported Rabbi Berman's words:

"You've no idea how kosher salami boosts morale, whether the boy who eats it is named Kinkelstein or Riley."

## WINS BRONZE STAR

The rabbi was decorated with the Bronze Star on Okinawa. "Often under fire and always an example to the men with whom he came in contact," read the citation, "Chaplain Berman's conduct was in keeping with Army traditions."

Later he went with the 6th Marine Division to Tsingtao, China. He helped reestablish the Jewish community there and provide it with a synagog. Until the Communists occupied the city, he often heard from the friends he had made there.

Rabbi Berman had come in 1937 to Temple Israel in 1937, then 85 years old. There he returned after the war, active again in Zionist, welfare and civic affairs.

## FATHER OF THREE

His first wife, Grayce Sunshine Hoffelmer Berman, of Richmond, Va., died in 1949. They had one son, John Simon, whose first child, Ronald, is now 2 years old.

In 1950 Rabbi Berman married Elaine Ruth Siegel Levy, and they have a son, 2, and a daughter, 4.

At his synagog, next Friday night, a special service will celebrate his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. Sunday night he will be the guest of honor at a banquet in the Standard Club.

Then he'll go to St. Louis for 2 weeks of active duty in the Navy.

"I'll tell the story of religion in the Armed Forces," he says. "I'll speak to university, civic, and religious groups to help parents and young people appreciate what the chaplaincy can do and is doing to serve our military youth."

## MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will have before us the proposed 1957 mutual security program to continue our military and economic aid to friendly, free governments.

In considering our efforts to assist friendly, foreign nations, and particularly the underdeveloped areas, to strengthen and stabilize their economies to enable them more effectively to resist aggression, we should not overlook the role of private capital investment overseas. This thought is very well expressed in an editorial appearing in the April

1956 issue of Fortune entitled "The American Game."

In appraising the economic contest between Russia and America in promoting trade, capital investment, and technical assistance in underdeveloped regions of the world, this editorial says:

The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

Mr. Speaker, I expressed much the same thought in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives entitled "An Affirmative American Foreign Policy"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, pages 4209-4214. I then urged that a commission be created with the sole task of identifying artificial barriers to trade and investment abroad and recommending specific measures for eliminating or minimizing those barriers. That problem has not been solved, and the need for a thorough-going study of the character I recommended is as great, if not greater, today than it was then.

Nevertheless, as the Fortune editorial points out, great strides have been made by American private capital in overseas investments since the end of World War II notwithstanding the fact that our Government has not done all it could to create a climate favorable to the investment of private capital overseas, particularly in underdeveloped areas. At the end of World War II, the overseas investment of private capital was about \$13½ billion, whereas by 1955 it had reached \$26 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to direct the thinking of leaders both in Congress and in the administration to the great potential contribution which private American citizens and United States business can make toward assisting friendly, free countries through private enterprise principles, to develop their resources, to enhance their economic strength and stability and to improve the standard of living of their citizens.

I hope all Members of the Congress will take the time to read the Fortune editorial which I incorporate at this point in my remarks.

## THE AMERICAN GAME

Can Stalingrad turn out better and cheaper tractors than Peoria, Ill.? Can Lenin-grad do a faster and more efficient job of building electric turbines than Schenectady? "Yes," the Russians seem to be saying, as they push forward their much-publicized economic offensive. In their loud offers of trade, capital, and technical assistance to the underdeveloped regions of the world, the Russians, as Secretary Dulles recently put it, seem to be playing the American game. And, added Mr. Dulles significantly, "If we cannot beat them at our own game we ought to be ashamed of ourselves."

We should indeed. Unfortunately neither Mr. Dulles nor other spokesmen for the administration have been too clear as to what the American game is or should be. Nor have the Democrats, who have gone into a



great election-year flip over recent Soviet maneuvers. As a result, most United States discussion of how to meet the new Russian line has centered on the somewhat tired topic of United States foreign aid. The administration believes such aid should be made more flexible (to back projects like the Aswan Dam in Egypt) but should be held to about \$4.3 billion in the fiscal year of 1957. Chester Bowles, however, wants a new Marshall plan for Asia. And only the other day former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., turned up in India advocating an immediate \$500 million loan to that country.

Mr. Morgenthau is not usually a fountainhead of wisdom, but in one sense he has a point. If the real answer to the Soviet offensive were simply the pouring out of Government money, then the present aid program would indeed be small for a \$400 billion economy. The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

#### O. K., LET'S TRADE

Those assets are already considerable. In his speech to the 20th Communist Party Congress 6 weeks ago, which touched off the current debate on United States foreign policy, Mr. Khrushchev proposed the slogan: "Let us trade." As it happens, the United States does do some trading and that on a considerable scale. In 1955 commercial exports of United States goods and services ran to \$19.6 billion, or about 4½ times prewar levels, and imports ran to \$17.6 billion. The famous dollar shortage, which so troubled monetary experts after World War II, has to all intents and purposes disappeared; European nations have been accumulating gold and exchange; and world commerce has been rapidly gaining ground. Total world exports outside the Soviet bloc ran last year to about \$80 billion, and on the basis of present trends could reach \$150 billion in the next 25 years. While no reliable figures exist for Russia's trade with its satellites, the total of Communist exports to the outside world ran in 1954 to only \$1.5 billion. It will always be possible for Moscow to engineer highly publicized deals, but such deals are no substitute for a true multilateral system of exchange wherein individuals and corporations expand their own markets.

The main drive of American policy, therefore, should continue to be the reduction of trade barriers, elimination of quotas, and the further promotion of currency convertibility. Such convertibility would not only free up the channels of trade but accelerate capital investment, which is the true key to raising the productivity of other nations. Here again the United States and the West have an advantage that is all too easily overlooked. Of a promised \$500 million of economic credits and grants to outside countries, the Communists have thus far delivered only about \$23 million in aid. But year in year out United States business invests between \$1 billion and \$2 billion abroad. And at the end of 1955 its total long-term commitments overseas stood at nearly \$26 billion.

Through such investment the American oilman has transformed Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. The steel industry has tapped the iron-ore reserves of South America and Labrador. On the completion of present expansion programs General Motors and Ford will have poured over \$1 billion into foreign plants since World War II. And in addition

to these major moves, thousands of smaller ones are swelling the stream. Thus Caterpillar Tractor is currently building one of the largest plants in Scotland. Pfizer has spent \$30 million in the past 5 years, notably in England and France. The Container Corp. is making a \$6-million bid in Germany. Borden Co. recently announced it will build a \$3,500,000 methanol plant in Brazil, and B. F. Goodrich International is spending some \$6 million in the Philippines.

#### TIMID DOLLARS?

It is true, of course, that American private long-term investment tends to go where the going is safest, and that some 80 percent of such investment is concentrated in Canada, South America, and Western Europe. Except in oil, private commitments tend to be small in the Middle East, and Far East, where communism is making its most vocal bid. But this fact scarcely argues for pouring Government funds into those areas without seeking to deal with the fundamental causes that impede normal capital flow. These are political instability, a disregard for sound money, and, in the case of India, laws that make private investment subject to confiscation at the whim of the state.

In these underdeveloped and undercapitalized countries, the American answer should be a determined campaign, pressed by diplomatic means, to create a more receptive climate for free enterprise. In support of such a campaign the United States can rely on at least two instrumentalities that have proved their worth. One is the Export-Import Bank, which has helped in capital development chiefly in Latin America. The second agency is the World Bank, which, through loans now amounting to \$2.5 billion, has helped set in motion projects worth over \$5.5 billion. Thus by lending \$10 million to the Industrial Credit & Investment Corp. in India, the bank has sparked a \$35 million undertaking. Its loan of \$16 million to the Tata Hydro-Electric Power Supply Co. is building a \$27,500,000 electric-power installation. And it is now considering a further loan to the Tata Iron & Steel Co. for a new mill at Jamshedpur. This kind of lending involves intergovernmental negotiation, but it works within the framework of accepted business procedure. And precisely because the World Bank has stuck to hardheaded business rules, it now finds itself in the enviable position of being able to float its own bonds in world markets. Thus it acts as a kind of bridge between capitalism and countries that are unwilling or unable to open their doors wide to the private entrepreneur. Such a bridge is well worth maintaining so long as it is viewed as a means of inducing normal capital development rather than as a substitute for it.

#### AID VERSUS POLICY

Once due emphasis has been placed on what the United States is already doing abroad, the question of further Government aid falls into perspective. In the present fiscal year the United States is giving other nations some \$2.4 billion for arms and \$1.7 billion for economic assistance. Much of this economic aid is really military in character since it goes to countries like South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, and Turkey, which are maintaining relatively large armies in the field. Such countries clearly need and deserve United States help since they are holding a line against Communist advance that would otherwise have to be held by United States troops or given up entirely; and the support of such armies is something that cannot be done by private means and must be done by governments. Likewise justified are expenditures for technical assistance, which has proved itself one of the more successful of Washington's ventures.

Far more debatable are proposals for greatly enlarging the scope of direct government

grants for development purposes. Irrigation projects, harbors, and roads can contribute to a backward country's advance, but there are limits to what can be absorbed, and the conditions laid down are all-important. The building of the Aswan Dam across the Nile will benefit Egypt only if inflationary forces are held in check (see *Business Globe*, p. 78) and certainly United States funds for such undertakings will be dissipated unless other means of financing—public and private—take hold. Indeed, to call what the Government grants in these cases "seed money" is in a way an inversion of terms. For the true seed money of economic advance is not what governments do but rather what private individuals are allowed to do for themselves.

Economic aid, in short, makes sense only within the framework of a much larger policy. Such policy should be to project outward the principles that have built this country from a struggling colonial dependency to the world's foremost power. Those principles are in the first instance moral and political, and are rooted in a deep attachment to freedom and justice. But the necessary corollary to political freedom is economic freedom as opposed to State-imposed controls, and the necessary corollary to justice is respect for private property and the sanctity of contract. In an age of central planning it is not easy to reassert these truths, but unless they are reasserted the inherent power of the United States will never be harnessed to the task that now faces the country. Communism comes before the world with vast promises of economic betterment, which in the end turn out to be an invitation to tyranny. The American mission is to demonstrate by deed as well as word that there is an alternative to this subversion of all human values. The mission will be fulfilled as donation diplomacy gives way to adherence to the basic political and economic philosophy that animates our own flexible and humane society.

#### DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE ACT

Mr. KILDAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

#### ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees.

#### MASS TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, MACK of Illinois, ROGERS of Texas, WOLVERTON, HINSHAW, and DOLLIVER.

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 410)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning without my approval H. R. 1835, for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

This bill would have the United States accept as a binding obligation and agree to pay to Sedgwick County, Kans., \$259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of taxes for the tax year 1947 against certain real property formerly owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This payment is contingent upon enactment by the Kansas Legislature of a law authorizing and directing acceptance of this amount as payment in full and as a release and forgiveness of all interest, penalties, liens, and charges connected with the taxes.

The property in question was acquired in 1942 by the Defense Plants Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Effective July 1, 1945, the Defense Plants Corporation was liquidated, and the property involved was transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Subsequently, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation declared the property surplus, and on April 16, 1947, the War Assets Administration accepted responsibility and authority for the property. On February 25, 1948, the War Assets Administrator, acting on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, deeded the property to the United States, and custody and accountability was thereupon transferred to the Department of the Air Force, which has retained jurisdiction ever since.

The Federal Government is constitutionally immune from taxation by States upon property owned by the United States. The Congress may waive that immunity, and by general legislation it did so on real property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the property involved here, however, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took the position that the laws of Kansas themselves exempted the property from taxation. To settle this and other issues, the Congress enacted Public Law 5, 82d Congress, which gave the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the claim of Sedgwick County for taxes on this property for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947. Under this authority the Court of Claims, by decision dated July 15, 1952, determined that there was liability for taxes for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, but not for the year 1947. The court considered separately the question of taxes for the year 1947. It concluded, in reliance upon decisions of the Kansas Supreme Court, that there was no 1947 tax due prior to the effective date of levy, which under the law then applicable was November 1. Since the transfer from the Reconstruction Fi-

nance Corporation to the War Assets Administration took place in April, no tax could become due for 1947 because the constitutional immunity had revived upon the date of the transfer, April 16.

The transfer of the property from the War Assets Administration to the Department of the Air Force in February 1948 has continued the tax immunity. However, as an interim measure, the Congress last year enacted legislation (Public Law 388, 84th Cong., approved August 12, 1955) which is designed specifically to furnish temporary relief for the calendar years 1955 through 1958 for taxing authorities which have suffered an unexpected loss of revenue as a result of the Court of Claims decision in the Sedgwick County case. The Government is now making payments under that legislation, and I am informed that Sedgwick County has already filed its application for payment in lieu of taxes for the year 1955.

In the light of the foregoing facts, I believe that in considering this bill, which relates exclusively to the year 1947, I must also consider whether a claim for taxes for that year can be differentiated from a claim for the succeeding years up to 1955. The record in the case says that the Government applied for tax immunity for 1948 and subsequent years. Any such application has no bearing on the constitutional immunity. Therefore, I find no basis of distinction. I believe that to approve this bill would be a precedent for approving legislation for the other years, should claim be made. I also believe that to approve a bill for one piece of property, for one particular taxing jurisdiction, and for one particular year, would be to discriminate against other jurisdictions which are known to be similarly situated because of transfers of property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or because of the Sedgwick County decision.

Furthermore, I believe that approval of H. R. 1835 would be contrary to the principles pertaining to payments in lieu of taxation which this administration has recommended to the Congress following study of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That Commission recommended "that the National Government inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments," with particular reference to commercial and industrial property. After careful consideration of this general recommendation, I came to the conclusion that the magnitude and complexity of the problem is such that only a strictly limited program would be warranted at this time. Accordingly, it was recommended that any legislation should be restricted in application to communities which are able to demonstrate financial hardship directly attributable to Federal removal of real property from the tax rolls. It was further suggested by the administration that this limited program be applied prospectively and then only to properties removed from the local tax rolls subsequent to June 30, 1950.

In addition to these general objections to the bill, I believe that the contingency proviso also is objectionable.

Approval of any such provision, in my judgment, would imply acceptance of the principle that the United States Government is not immune from interest and other penalties. Federal immunity in these respects does not depend upon State law.

Fairness of treatment, and the same treatment for all similarly situated State and local taxing jurisdictions, must be the rule in any proposal for adjustment or imposition of tax liability upon the United States. Of course, we must also strive to relieve the hardship which may result from unnecessary inflexibility in the law. However, I believe that the enactment of individual, piecemeal bills does not serve the long-run best interests of either local jurisdictions or the Federal Government. If statutory relief is to be granted, the legislation authorizing such relief should be limited as I have indicated and should be of general applicability.

For these reasons, I return H. R. 1835 without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 22, 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

**NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM**

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to help meet two of the most critical problems facing our Nation today: The growing shortages in the teaching and science professions.

Today, as we cross the threshold into the nuclear era, we must face the fact that our future strength as a nation rests with the children who are now being educated and who will be educated in the next generation.

Recent magazine and newspaper articles have focused attention on the critical shortage of teachers, but I seriously doubt if the real implications of this scarcity have been realized. When schools opened in September 1955, the United States Office of Education estimated that there was a shortage of more than 140,000 teachers. The projected figures over the next 10 years give us even greater cause to stop and think—and act. The Ford Foundation has pointed out that to maintain the present teacher-student ratio, teaching staffs will have to be increased in the next 10 years more than they have increased over the past 35 years. Colleges and universities will have to add more teachers in the next 15 years than in all previous United States history combined. We will need 1,906,889 new teachers by 1965



to replace those who die or leave the profession, and to meet increased enrollments. If this need is to be met, one-half of all college graduates expected during the next decade will have to enter the teaching field. In past years, only one-fifth of all college graduates have entered this profession.

We all know that when there are not enough teachers to go around, something has to give. What gives, of course, is the quality of our teaching, for class sizes become swollen and unqualified teachers must be hired. Today, 35 percent of all public elementary teachers have had less than 4 years of college, and 6 percent have had less than 2 years.

There are many factors involved in the teacher shortage, which deserve the fullest consideration and study. Not the least of these is the salary scale. Many semiskilled laborers receive better pay than the men and women who teach our children. The problem is not that the salary scale of the workers is too high, but simply that our teachers receive too little. Small wonder that many of them, especially those with families to raise, find that they must leave the profession if they are to make ends meet.

Another factor affecting the scarcity of teachers is that too few of our high-school graduates go on to college at all. More than half of the top quarter in intelligence of our high-school-age youth never go on to college. Surveys indicate that the majority of these students simply cannot afford to continue their education. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such a waste of good minds is one which our Nation cannot afford.

There has been an increase in the number of scholarship programs developed by industry, philanthropic institutions, and the like. Unfortunately, however, they do not meet the demand—nor the critical need which faces us today and which bears so directly upon our national life. That is why I feel that Government must act now to help meet the emergency.

One of the provisions of my bill would create 50,000 scholarships a year for the next 10 years for students entering the field of education. Before the bogey of Federal control of education is raised, let me point out that this is often only a smokescreen raised by those who are reluctant to act. We have seen during the administration of the GI bill of rights that Federal financing of a student's college education has not resulted in Government control over the policies or curriculum of our colleges and universities. To administer the program of scholarships, there would be created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the position of Director of Scholarships and a Board of 16 drawn from the professional field who would set standards for the recipients of scholarships, making tuition payments direct to the various institutions, and make subsistence payments direct to the qualifying students. Scholarships would be divided on a statewide basis in proportion to the number of high school graduates in each State.

Directly related to the teacher shortage is the equally critical shortage in trained personnel in the scientific fields.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. Twenty-three percent of our Nation's public high schools offer no courses in physics and chemistry. During 1954-55, a total of 7,900 science teachers were needed, but only 3,600 were trained, and of these only 1,700 actually entered the teaching field. According to the National Education Association, the output of science teachers has declined 57 percent from 1950 to 1955. This at a time when science and technology are the very cornerstones of our security and our hope for peacetime prosperity. Yet, how can we expect our young people to become interested in the further study of science when they have been given no chance of becoming acquainted with it.

The second provision of my scholarship bill provides for 20,000 undergraduate scholarships a year for 10 years for qualified students in the field of science.

The president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, J. R. Killian, Jr., stated in a recent article for *Life* magazine that our shortage of scientists has become the "best advertised shortage of our time" because of the well-known fact that Russia has been producing more trained scientists than has the United States. Mr. Killian went on to propose a series of national scholarships to meet our emergency needs. He did prefer to have these scholarships financed by private sources, but he also felt that until private funds were available the Federal Government should do something to fill the partial vacuum. I certainly agree with Mr. Killian.

Because quality is as important as quantity, my bill also sets up 5,000 post-graduate scholarships a year in the field of science. This should enable some of our gifted students to continue their education rather than face the necessity of having to accept positions after receiving their B. S. degree. Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to be proud of the men and women whom we entrust today with the education of our children. They are doing an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances. But they need help—and the help of tomorrow must be trained today.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we must face squarely the fact that the scientific demands of our Nation in this highly technological era are falling upon too few shoulders. It may be no exaggeration to say that the outcome of the cold war and America's continued leadership may well depend upon how squarely we face the challenging task before us. For this reason, I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will consider my proposals as soon as possible. In the life of both people and nations, there comes a time for decision and action. With respect to our future teachers and scientists, that time is now.

#### REBUILDING THE BRAIN-WASHED, FLOUNDERING SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the time this statement is being prepared, 2 years have passed; 2 summers, with the

length of 2 long winters—to paraphrase the poet Wordsworth—since the epochal decision of the Supreme Court overturning a decision that had been followed for 75 years declaring that the doctrine of separate but equal facilities was not a violation of the Constitution.

This decision overturned all precedents and actually amounted to an amendment of the Constitution by one of the coordinate branches of our Government that has no right under the Constitution to amend it. It sought at one fell swoop to destroy the way of life and the social institutions of a great segment of the American people. But only now is the full import of the decision being realized. During the 2 years the determination of the people most vitally affected by the decision has been hardened and its thinking crystallized on the solution of the problem.

Sometimes it is said that the decision of the Supreme Court is the law of the land whether we believe the decision to be legally right or wrong. This is not an accurate statement of the situation. It is true that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is binding upon all persons who were parties before it in the litigation of that particular case until it is reversed or made ineffective by legislation by the Congress. This is the extent of the authority of the Supreme Court to enforce its decision. It is upon this basis that the South will oppose the destruction of its school system until the people of the United States and every section of this great country come to realize the enormity of the error which the Supreme Court has committed in this civilization-shaking decision.

Many have claimed that we have no right to criticize the Supreme Court or to oppose an application of its unwarranted and erroneous decisions. However, the right of free speech in America extends to the right to criticize even the Supreme Court and its members.

In the first place, by its decision in the school case, the Supreme Court ignored a warning of George Washington in his Farewell Address. I have previously inserted this warning in the *RECORD* but it is so important that I want to repeat it here. It is as follows:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Recently my own colleague from Georgia, the Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, in a learned and convincing statement to the House referred to and quoted Lincoln's criticism of the Supreme Court after the Dred Scott decision. President Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 9, 1937, commenting on a decision of the Supreme Court said:

The Court in addition to the proper use of its judicial functions has improperly set itself up as a third house of the Congress—a superlegislature, as one of the justices has called it—reading into the Constitution words and implications which are not there.

We have, therefore, reached the point as a Nation where we must take action to save the Constitution from the Court and the Court from itself \* \* \*.

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

I call your especial attention to the last paragraph of the quotation, to wit:

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

But the purpose of my statement today has not been to discuss the question of segregation. It is rather to bring to your attention a fact that has been cited by many of my colleagues including some from the Northern States as well as from the South and that is that the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is not the only decision that shows the determination of the Supreme Court to ignore precedents, to usurp the field of legislation and the power to amend the Constitution. One of the strongest indictments against the Supreme Court is that voiced in a masterly fashion by a former Justice of that Court—James F. Byrnes of South Carolina. In an article in *U. S. News & World Report*, entitled "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed," he brings a strong indictment against the Supreme Court for its refusal to follow precedent, and for its invasion not only of the legislative branch of our Government but of the rights of the States to determine their own internal affairs.

In this connection, Mr. Byrnes says:

Tragic as may be the consequences in destroying the public school system in the South, more frightening are the consequences of the trend of the present Court to destroy the powers of the 48 States.

He then quotes the case of *Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson*, decided April 2, 1956, which invalidated the laws of 42 States prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by violence as long as there is a Federal law against sedition. As criticism of the other members of the Court, Justices Reed, Burton and Minton rendered a vigorous dissenting opinion. Only 1 week later, the Court in the *Slochower* case held unconstitutional a New York City charter provision requiring dismissal of employees who refused to answer questions asked by legally constituted bodies.

The *Wall Street Journal* in an editorial which appeared in that daily newspaper on Thursday, May 17, said that the decision "threw a cloud over similar laws elsewhere, as well as a protective cloak over teachers who choose to be less than honest and forthright." On the Natural Gas Act ruling of several years ago, the minority of the Court wrote that the majority had transgressed the exemption granted producers and that good faith required the Court to interpret the act as "its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it." There are other minority opinions which criticize the court for its failure to determine the intention of the Congress in framing its legislation and in actually ignoring express statements of the congressional intent. There are also other recent decisions that show the determination of

the Court to overstep the functions assigned to it. These have been discussed on the floor of this House during the past few weeks and I do not need to refer to them. A very influential official of the American Bar Association has stated that 90 percent of the lawyers in America have lost faith in our present Supreme Court because of its tendency to ignore precedents, to forget the rule of *stare decisis* and to arrogate unto themselves the powers and duties imposed by the Constitution upon the Congress as well as because of its effrontery to attempt to rewrite the Constitution and to reinterpret it on grounds other than legal precedent and the laws which express the will of the Congress in any particular field. Not only does former Senator and Justice Byrnes bitterly criticize the Supreme Court but there are many other former jurists of brilliant intellect who are disturbed and alarmed at the tendency of the present Court to upset long established precedents and sally forth upon the uncharted seas of pseudosociology, neo-Freudian psychology and the political and sociological feelings of the present members of the Supreme Court. In this connection, I am including in my statement a letter recently written me by an honored former justice of the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, that grand old jurist, Samuel H. Sibley, who would have served with distinction on the United States Supreme Court. At 90 years, he is still vigorous and his mind is as clear as ever. His letter to me reads as follows:

MARIETTA, Ga., December 9, 1955.

Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM,

Rome, Ga.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noticed with interest your recently expressed opinion that the decisions of the Supreme Court were not judicial action, but legislative, and in undertaking to regulate the conduct of the schools both in the States and in the District of Columbia, and consequently are not within the competency of the Court to make. I note this morning that the same view was argued last night by Georgia's attorney general at Yale. I feel that this is the true question of all the argument, and not the merits or demerits of segregation itself. I have seen it this way all along, and as a member of the country's high judiciary, I am concerned at the action of our High Court in this matter, adding the capstone to a series of legislative decisions made by the Court in the past 10 years. We old judges, so far as I know, all feel that the Court is ceasing often to act as lawyers declaring the law what it is, and seeking to make the law what they think it ought to be. This is, of course, legislation, no matter who does it. It is forbidden by the first sentence of the Constitution to all branches of the Federal Government except the Congress. "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The Supreme Court has no part in it. Its intrusion into that field is a violation of the Constitution. Yet I have seen no discussion, and no quotation even of this first sentence of the Constitution that stands wholly unchanged. The 14th amendment has no purpose to alter this, for its concluding words are "The Congress shall have power to enforce this amendment," not the Supreme Court.

But supposing that this is otherwise, the 14th amendment has nothing to do with the District of Columbia, and the Court so ad-

mits in its decision on the District's schools. The Congress has, as is well established, plenary government over the District, including the right to establish public schools. The Congress exercised that right, and enacted in the original and subsequent laws about that the races had best be segregated. If the time has come to deal otherwise with the schools, the question is so plainly a question for the Congress which established them, that I can see no basis to think otherwise. Congress alone may legislate about it, in those schools.

The judges of the Supreme Court are no doubt sincere men and think they have done right, but they have acted as reformers rather than judges, and exceeded their authority, most plainly in dealing with the District of Columbia. It seems to me that the Congress ought at least to strongly protest this invasion of their powers. I do not think it is a case for impeachment, but it is a case for a strong assertion of congressional prerogative, as expressed in the first sentence of the Constitution, that we all have sworn not only to respect, but also to support. As I am a judge, in commission though retired, I urge that the Congress by some appropriate action assert itself. It has a public duty to do this. It may give pause to those who have not seen the matter in that light.

Let the State schools stand apart for the present. I am talking about the duty of our Senators and Congressmen. They may leave the States and their schools to fight it out as best they can, but can they in duty shut their eyes to a very plain invasion of the rights and obligations of the Congress in respect to the Government of the District? Full thought and discussion of this point may well aid to clarify the whole question of the propriety of segregation, and the need to deal with it by Federal power, and how that need ought to be expressed.

Six months ago I publicly expressed my views on this subject in an address in Atlanta. The last part of it alone deals with the particular matter I am now arguing, but this is my only copy and I don't wish to dismember it. Read and use any of it which you may wish, and then return to me, please. I send it in what I take as the line of a judge's public duty.

With high personal regards,

Yours sincerely,

SAM. H. SIBLEY.

To show the utter confusion in the present Supreme Court and the inability of its members to construe and apply the Constitution and the laws of the land, my own colleague from Georgia, the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, recently emphasized the present situation in the Court as exemplified in its recent decision in the case of *Cahill* against New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Mr. PRESTON brought the glaring light of publicity upon the hesitation and confusion of the Court, by introducing a bill to pay the plaintiff in the cited case the \$90,000, that had been awarded him by the lower court and approved by the United States Supreme Court by an order which was later vacated after the defendant in the original suit had paid the judgment to the plaintiff in that suit who, in turn, had already spent much of the money he thought he had won by the original Supreme Court order.

There is no doubt but that the present situation is a most serious one. As former Senator Byrnes has so cogently said, even the destruction of public schools in the South may not be as injurious to the Nation as the uncertainty that prevails



as a result of the vacillation of the Supreme Court and its tendency to forsake the law as it has stood for years and substitute its own whims and vagaries for the established law of the land. No longer does an attorney know how to advise his clients. The law as announced by the United States Supreme Court may be one thing today and directly the opposite tomorrow. Confusion grows worse confounded. As former Justice Byrnes says, the Court must be curbed.

That the Congress does have the right to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its entering into fields reserved to the States by the Constitution is asserted by Mr. Byrnes in his excellent discussion of the whole problem. In recent days, I have received a most learned and well-authenticated opinion from the Honorable Eugene Cook, the attorney general of Georgia, establishing without a doubt the fact that the Congress may limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its overstepping the bounds set by the Constitution and invading the rights of the sovereign States.

Quite often the constituents of southern Congressmen are clamorous in their demands that we do something to overrule the decision in the school cases. Of course, that is a present impossibility due to the fact that the 100 Members of the Congress who signed the recent much-discussed manifesto or statement of our position, just about represents the votes that we would get for any such effort on our part.

Neither do we have the votes today that would be necessary to impeach the present members of the Supreme Court although our people in the South feel so intensely antagonistic to the Court that they demand that we resort to this harsh remedy for the present situation.

But I come before you today not to insist upon any of these impossible remedies but to discuss with you what can be done not to reverse the Court on the matter of segregation but to bring it back into its field of the interpretation of the Constitution and the laws of Congress according to the intention of the Congress and the precedents and established rules of construction of the Constitution.

It is said that more than 70 bills have been introduced into Congress to try to limit the Supreme Court and insist that the Court exercise its own functions and not trespass upon those of the Congress and the States.

One of these bills is H. R. 3, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I think this legislation is demanded and that it is the first step we should take in the effort to force the Supreme Court to consider the intent of Congress and not to flout that intent and treat it with contempt. As Mr. SMITH himself has said, his bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of segregation of the races in our public schools. I am heartily in favor of this bill and hope that the people of our country will demand its enactment when they come to realize that more and more the Supreme Court is invading the province of their own States and of their Representatives in the Congress.

There may be other remedies that we can apply and they may be embodied in the more than 70 bills that have been introduced for this purpose. I have not had the time to study all of these bills or to formulate one for myself which would properly limit the powers of the Court.

I believe fundamentally that President Roosevelt was right when he stated that "Our difficulty with the court today rises not from the court as an institution but from the human beings within it." President Roosevelt's remark was probably a prelude to his sinister court packing idea. Apparently he wanted to fill the court with subservient political hacks so that he might dominate it. Fortunately, his court packing idea was defeated but, nonetheless, he did, in a sense, pack the court with the kind of people he wanted on it because of the death and retirement of so many of the justices during his era. Certain it is that we cannot hope for the proper decisions from the Supreme Court if the members of that court are not learned in the law and its precedents. If our court is made up of political hacks as Vice President Nixon has charged, insofar as the Chief Justice is concerned, then we cannot expect sound legal decisions to come from that body. So the fundamental problem is the problem of reconstituting the court. This will be a long and perilous project but, nevertheless, we must undertake it. Recently when I was at home, a friend of mine stated it this way. He said that it had taken 35 years to corrupt the Supreme Court and that it would take that long to clean it up and fill it with men who have had judicial experience and who have the temperament and training to make them render sound legal decisions. I am sure my friend did not mean "corrupt" in the sense that the present members of the court are morally corrupt. In my opinion, the trouble is not political corruption but the corruption of their ideas and concepts of justice. Frankly, I think its members have been brain washed. The brain washing has been done by the alleged sociologist and psychologist, Dr. Karl Gunnar Myrdal and his associates. It was in his book, the American Dilemma, that Dr. Myrdal stated that the American Constitution was outmoded; and the other dabblers in the field of sociology and psychology to which the Supreme Court turned instead of to legal precedents in the school cases were of like mind with Dr. Myrdal that the Constitution is outmoded. Consequently, the Supreme Court, after its brain washing by this man, Myrdal, and his shocking pink, if not Red, associates—some of them indeed are included as members in Communist front organizations named by our Department of Justice as such—overturned legal decisions by such giants of previous Supreme Courts as Justices Holmes, Taft, and Brandeis. I will not try to document this statement further since it has been done so ably by the distinguished lawyer, my good friend from Dalton, Ga., the Honorable Carter Pittman. To show you that this man Pittman is a distinguished lawyer himself and recognized as such in his profession, the United States Su-

preme Court has on several occasions used and quoted as authority a study Mr. Pittman made 25 years ago on the history of the privilege against self-incrimination. Mr. Pittman is at present the president of the States Rights Councils of Georgia and has written an article for the American Bar Association Journal entitled "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," which will appear in the next issue.

As confirmation of my assertion that the Court has been brain washed by these wild Communist-inspired pseudo-scientists not in the field of law but in the uncharted field of psychology and sociology, I refer you to an article written by this same distinguished lawyer, the Honorable Carter Pittman, introduced by me into the daily RECORD of February 28, 1956, at page A1858. To say that the Court has been brain washed is the softest impeachment I can command to designate the present members of the Court.

How, then, is the Court to be reconstituted and cleansed of its aberrations and flights into esoteric fields foreign to the law? Even Mr. Byrnes in his excellent article does not attempt to answer this question, but I am convinced that it must be done by writing into the law qualifications for persons proposed by the President to become Justices of the United States Supreme Court. I know that some have questioned the power of the Congress to in this way circumscribe the President's right to appoint political hacks or other incompetents if he so sees fit. In the other body, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has introduced a bill to require 5 years' judicial experience before appointment to the Court. Senator STENNIS has introduced a similar bill, but, recognizing that some question has been raised as to the right of the Congress to limit the President's power of appointment, he has introduced a bill which would set up standards for the Senate to follow in confirming members appointed by the President to the Supreme Court.

There are absolutely no qualifications laid down either in our Constitution or in the laws of our land for appointment of members of the Supreme Court who have the right to "slap down," so to speak, even the President of the United States, as was indicated in the rebuke to President Truman when he seized the steel industry to end a nationwide crippling strike in that industry. The Constitution does say in article I, section I, that—

No person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of 35 years and been 14 years a resident within the United States.

It is passing strange that no such qualifications for appointment to the Supreme Court have ever been written into the law of our land. Surely if the President must be a natural born citizen, the members of the Supreme Court should at least meet that qualification. Consequently, I have prepared a bill which does set up qualifications up to

which persons must measure before they are confirmed to serve on the United States Supreme Court. Not only do I include in this bill, which I have today introduced into the House, a requirement that Supreme Court justices must be native born, must be at least 35 years of age and have been 14 years a resident within the United States, the identical requirements for the President, but in addition, my bill provides that such intended appointees must have been graduated by a law school approved by the American Bar Association or admitted to the bar of a court of general jurisdiction in any State, Territory, possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia. Such appointee must have practiced law for a total of not less than 5 years after having been admitted to the bar of any court of general jurisdiction as referred to above or must have had a total of not less than 5 years' judicial service.

These requirements may, of course, be changed after hearings by the committee to which it is referred. It will at least form a basis for legislation that will actually do something about the present intolerable situation in the highest court of our land to curb its aberrations, its discursions from the field of law into those of psychology, sociology and mythology and will make sure that its members are well grounded in the law, its precedents and its standards of legal ethics. My bill is the most comprehensive and, I believe, the best considered approach to the long-range rebuilding of the Court.

As the Wall Street Journal said in its excellent editorial on the subject in its issue of May 17, 1956, "There is only a need to curb the use of the Court as a reward for political service or a sinecure for political friends." This excellent newspaper has certainly put its finger upon the very essence of the matter. Vice President Nixon's boast that it was a Republican political Chief Justice who had brought about the infamous school decision has cast a shadow upon the entire Court. All in all, the people of America are not going to be satisfied until the Congress does something to eliminate political hacks from our Supreme Court and fill it with men of legal background and training, of ability, and of such integrity and character that they can rise above the winds of politics, of wild-eyed Socialists, pinkos, and their dreamworld doctrines of social laws, psychology, and even mythology. Perchance by the introduction of this bill I have at least made a start toward the long and uphill battle to restore the Supreme Court to the confidence of our people and the legal reliance of the lawyers of America.

DR. RAYBURN AND DR. MARTIN AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to learn from the lips of our able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHL-MAN], that in Syracuse, N. Y., on Monday, June 4, it will be Dr. RAYBURN and Dr. MARTIN.

The announcement that Syracuse University would on the date indicated confer honorary degrees on these two great American legislative leaders has been hailed by the public and the press. Members of the House and Senate concur in the feeling it is a most timely and deserved tribute.

"What a natural to honor SAM and JOE in this way. What a picture both will make as speakers on that platform at Archbold Stadium at Syracuse," was one Member's comment.

Speaker RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, has had 42 years of service in the House, and former Speaker MARTIN, Massachusetts Republican, can count 32 years of such service. RAYBURN's service as Speaker is a record. The two have contributed much to the legislative history of our country during periods of great crises and every student of the American way of life knows them for their love and devotion to their country.

In scoring this first, I desire to salute the great University of Syracuse on the June 4 honors it plans for the great leaders of this body. In a very true sense Syracuse is honoring the American Congress.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, for a period beginning Thursday, May 24, and ending July 19, on account of official business, attendance as a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization to be held in Geneva, Switzerland.

To Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. DEMPSEY), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), today and tomorrow, on account of illness in the immediate family.

To Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for the week of May 28, on account of official business.

To Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, for 7 days, on account of official business.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON to revise and extend the remarks which he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER on the matter of the recent directives of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include testimony before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LOVRE to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

#### SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2722. An act for the relief of Fai Hoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2937. An act to increase from \$50 to \$75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955, (69 Stat. 55), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oreg.;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of

the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9257. An act 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 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:

1881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to donate certain small craft to the United States Volunteer Life Savings Corps to be used in rescue work and training, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1882. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 35th Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1883. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes,' approved May 18, 1910"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1884. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the Revised

Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U. S. C. 1632); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1885. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1886. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 101 (c) of Public Law 768, 83d Congress, so as to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 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. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6332. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 2197). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2195). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee of conference. H. R. 5862. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation (Rept. No. 2196). Ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2194). 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. RICHARDS:  
H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11357. A bill to establish a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 11358. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11359. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11360. A bill to supplement the anti-trust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11361. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 11362. A bill for the relief of the Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District No. 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 11363. A bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 11364. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 11365. A bill to authorize deferment of repayments of certain emergency loans by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 11366. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11367. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11368. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11369. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11370. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 11371. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11372. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1952, with respect to the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service performed by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11373. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11374. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 11376. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 11377. A bill to amend section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to specify certain terms that must be contained in contracts for the purchase or construction of residential property; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11378. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain warrantors of housing sold under guaranteed, insured, or direct loans shall procure a performance bond; to authorize the Administrator to refuse to appraise certain residential property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11379. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11380. A bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11381. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands now required for community development adjacent to Cascade Reservoir, Boise Federal reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 11382. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 11383. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 11384. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11385. A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11386. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to establish in the Department of Defense an office of Under Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 11387. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11388. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 11389. A bill to amend section 4232 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain places where no instrumental music is provided shall not be treated as cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11390. A bill for the relief of Josephine Elenora Ambrose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11391. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Luísette Vilela Gomes de Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11392. A bill for the relief of Jose Trinidad Maldonado Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 11393. A bill for the relief of Petros Ioannou Calengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 11394. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Burawski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11395. A bill for the relief of Amabile Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 11396. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria del Rosario G. Arocena, Sister Maria Aranzazu A. Mendizabal, and Sister Maria Dolores O. Goyenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 11397. A bill for the relief of Simon Brill, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 11398. A bill for the relief of Michele De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief 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:

1063. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Frank White, Jr., and 44 other residents of Jamestown, N. Dak., and surrounding communities, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and



orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1064. Also, petition of Fred Sjoblom and 38 other residents of Bismarck, N. Dak., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1065. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Clyde J. Jones and 44 other residents of Renovo, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1066. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert E. Blasingame, Little Rock, Ark., and others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension

program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1067. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Wendle Bros., Inc., and 45 veterans of Spokane County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1068. Also, petition of William Tinsley and 44 other veterans of Spokane and Stevens County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1069. Also, petition of Mrs. Joan Bull and 20 other veterans of Spokane County, Wash.,

urging immediate enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1070. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of World War I veterans of Chariton, Iowa, urging the adoption of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1071. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Pulaski Democratic Club of Hartford, an organization of Americans of Polish ethnic origin, to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 beyond its expiration date of August 6, 1956, to enable persons escaping from behind the Iron Curtain to find in the United States a haven of peace, freedom, and liberty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Many Notable Dignitaries From Foreign Countries Have Visited the TVA

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years many heads of state, important personages and foreign dignitaries from many lands have visited the TVA. Foreign visitors to our country, as well as our own citizens, have come to look upon TVA as a superior example of government at work in the field of resource development and conservation of national resources. Certainly the TVA is a symbol of success of what a great government can do to protect lives and property, advance commerce, industry, and agriculture through cooperative endeavor between the people of a great region and the Federal Government. Because of this achievement and success TVA has become a great national and international asset. It is an international symbol of American engineering achievement—and TVA is visited annually by many notable visitors.

Among the distinguished dignitaries visiting TVA the following are included:

Prince Albert of Liege, Belgium, November 1955.

Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, July 1955.

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, of India, May 1954.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enroco Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, Ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

### Maritime Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today is that outstanding occasion which, unfortunately, occurs but once a year. It is Maritime Day.

I have just returned from a luncheon given by the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore. While there, I had the great privilege of introducing the guest of honor, our friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Of course, in looking about for an outstanding authority on maritime matters, it was only natural that the Propeller Club would give serious consideration to requesting the Senator from Massachusetts to deliver the Maritime Day address. During that time he did me, the Port of Baltimore Propeller Club, and the State of Maryland the great honor of delivering one of the finest Maritime Day addresses I have ever been privileged to hear. Accordingly, and for the purpose of sharing his remarks with the Members of the

Senate and the people generally, I send to the desk a copy of his speech, with a request for unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARITIME DAY LUNCHEON, PROPELLER CLUB OF BALTIMORE, MAY 22

Since I certainly don't want to sail into any port, especially Baltimore, under false colors, I think I should say right here and now that you fellows are competitors, strong competitors, of ours in Boston. This rivalry is one of the painful yet stimulating facts of Atlantic port life, and I want you to know that we recognize it as such.

Despite our rivalry, however—and it's a healthy one fundamentally—you in Baltimore and we in Boston have an equal and vital interest in maritime affairs as a whole. It is therefore essential that, as Baltimoreans and Bostonians, but even more importantly as Americans, we do everything within our power to see to it that a dynamic and progressive national maritime policy is maintained and implemented with commonsense, vigor, and foresight. Although we all recognize it, I think we can never overemphasize the dual importance of our merchant marine and our maritime industries to a healthy American economy and to our national defense.

Nearly 100 years of trial and error, marked in great part by the failure to recognize this dual importance of our merchant marine, failed to provide America with a stable maritime policy until Congress drafted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act is agreed to be a fundamental piece of maritime legislation, for it establishes a workable basis for maintaining a strong American merchant marine as a private enterprise venture, and at the same time strengthening the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as an essential arm of our national security and as an indispensable auxiliary of our armed services in event of national emergency.

In time of peace, reliable shipping service at reasonable rates requires that the United States carry a substantial part of its waterborne foreign commerce in American-flag vessels. During periods of economic depression, such as all nations have known in their history, the seafaring people have tended to give priority to their own commerce and their fleets have been instruments of national policy and trade promotion. But even in times of peace and prosperity such as we enjoy today, it is clear that if the strength of our American merchant marine is reduced or, indeed, if we were ever to be without it, foreign maritime powers would be in a posi-