GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

William T. Pecora, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Geological Survey.

IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The nominations beginning Henry Bosshard, to be senior surgeon, and ending Neil O. Hartman, to be senior assistant therapist, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 13, 1965.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate September 21 (legislative day of September 20), 1965:

POSTMASTERS

Wilma F. Majors to be postmaster at Russell Springs, in the State of Kansas.

Kae B. Weston to be postmaster at Laketown, in the State of Utah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: I Corinthians 4:2: *It is required of stewards that they be found faithful.*

Eternal God, whose voice bids us to be humble and penitent and faithful in these difficult days in which we are living, grant that we may not be found wanting in this bewildering perplexity which often confuses us.

We earnestly beseech Thee to renew our spiritual life of faith and inspire us with a passion that demands justice for the poor and the oppressed and gives courage to all mankind.

Help us to see our work in its true perspective and may we cultivate the upward look lest we become feverish and fretful and faithless.

Deepen our trust in Thee for we know that we can bear anything if our faith holds, but if we allow it to be eclipsed, then the way becomes dim.

Grant that we may never allow hardness to get into our hearts, but may we make a vow of fidelity knowing that Thou wilt help us to keep that vow and thus may we rise above our doubts and our dismay.

To Thy name shall be all the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 774. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States;

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp;

S. 2070. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

The message also 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 House to the bill (S. 1588) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and concurs therein.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed Senate Resolution 148, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Elmer Thomas, who served in the U.S. Senate from the State of Oklahoma from 1927 until 1951.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 66–5.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF PROCLAMATION TO "SEE THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

This resolution does nothing more than to extend for 1 year the authority to proclaim the "See the United States First" policy?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCLORY. It does not involve any expenditure of funds?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is just for extending Public Law 88–416 for another year. No money is required.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is Public Law 88?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Public Law 88–416 is a resolution to see the United States.

Mr. GROSS. To do what?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This program invites industry and interested organizations to encourage the American people to explore, use, and enjoy the historical, scenic, and recreation areas throughout the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. GROSS. I think that can very well be renewed, President Johnson not having had very much success in his campaign to stop tourism overseas. Anything we can do to emphasize tourism in the United States should help the deficit in the balance of payments.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 98

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested (1) to extend through 1966 the period designated pursuant to the joint resolution approved August 11, 1964 (Public Law 88–416), as a period to see the United States and its territories; (2) to encourage private industry and interested private organizations to continue their efforts to attract greater numbers of the American people to the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities of the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and (3) to issue a proclamation specifically inviting citizens of other countries to visit the festivals, fairs, pageants, and other ceremonials, to be celebrated in 1966 in the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to publicize any proclamations issued pursuant to the first section and otherwise to encourage and promote vacation travel within the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, both by American citizens and by citizens of other countries, through such departments or agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate, in cooperation with State and local agencies and private organizations.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of the extension provided for by this joint resolution, the President is authorized during the period of such extension to exercise the authority conferred by section 3 of the joint resolution approved August 11, 1964 (Public Law 88–416), and for such purpose may extend for such period the appointment of any person serving as National Chairman pursuant to such section.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN HOSPITAL OF PARIS

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9877) to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American Hospital of Paris, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 9 of said Act is amended by striking out: ': *Provided*, That at no time shall said corporation hold real estate except for the necessary use of office and hospital purposes of said hospital'."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ELMER THOMAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death in Lawton, Okla., Sunday of a distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Elmer Thomas, who represented the Sixth District of Oklahoma from March 4, 1923, to March 3, 1927.

He did not seek reelection to the House in 1926, having become a candidate for the U.S. Senate. He was elected as a Democrat to the Senate in 1926, relected in 1932, 1938, and again in 1944, serving from March 4, 1927, to January 3, 1951.

Senator Thomas was born on a farm near Greencastle, Putnam County, Ind., September 8, 1876. He was graduated from the Central Normal College—now Canterbury—at Danville, Ind., in 1897 and from DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., in 1900. He was admitted to the Indiana bar in 1897 and to the bar in Oklahoma in 1900. He began practice in Oklahoma City and later moved to Lawton where he continued the practice of law.

He was a member of the first State senate in Oklahoma in 1907 and served with great distinction until 1920, when he resigned. He served as president pro tempore from 1910 to 1913. He was a delegate to all of the Democratic State conventions from 1907 to 1950 and was chairman of the Democratic State Convention in 1910.

After he left the other body, he practiced law in Washington until August 1957, when he returned to Lawton.

It was my privilege to know this remarkable man all of my life. It was my extreme good fortune to enjoy the benefit of his counsel and advice.

Senator Thomas, who served many years as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in other body, was a recognized authority on agriculture and financial affairs. He was a student of the public affairs and kept well informed even after he had retired to private life. At every opportunity when I visited in Lawton, I paid him a visit to seek his views and comments on important issues facing the Congress and found him always graciously willing to spend his time in being helpful to a younger Member.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Oklahoma has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. The Congress has lost one of its most articulate former Members, and the Nation has lost a truly great statesman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] in this tribute to one of the great men in the history of our State. Senator Elmer Thomas served in the Congress of the United States a total of 28 years, 4 years in the House and 24 years in the Senate. Prior to that time he had served as a member of the first Oklahoma Senate in 1907 and in succeeding legislatures until 1920 when he resigned. He was considered by many to have been the outstanding member of the State senate during its early years.

Elmer Thomas served with extraordinary distinction in the U.S. Senate. He was a recognized authority on agriculture, finance, Indian legislation, and oil and gas, and these were also the areas of his leadership and responsibility on Senate legislative committees. He was for many years chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture which handled most of the important legislative measures in the field of agriculture which came out of the New Deal era.

He was the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

He was also chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. It was under his leadership that most of the military requirements of World War II were funded.

Senator Thomas through his foresight planned ahead for Oklahoma. He probably did as much as any person in our State to lay the groundwork for the great watershed developments on the Arkansas and Red Rivers; he certainly pioneered these projects in the Congress. His service to Oklahoma is second to none in all its history and his service to our Nation was of the highest order.

Senator Thomas' death is a great personal loss to me. I have known him ever since he made his first race for the U.S. Senate in 1926. He has been my friend over 39 years. I met him when he made his speech in my hometown of McAlester in the spring of 1926. In the spring of 1927 I was his guest here in the city of Washington while attending a national high school function. This was my first trip to our Nation's Capital. Senator Thomas met me at the Union Station. I was his guest at Arlington when President Coolidge made his Memorial Day address in May 1927.

I was in Senator Thomas' campaign actively in 1938. After I was elected to Congress he befriended me in many ways. He was always a kind counselor and close friend and a tremendous ally in legislative problems which affected our State.

Under the redistricting plan recently adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature, Comanche County in which he lived was placed in my district. I had looked forward to serving him as his Congressman and having him in my constituency.

I shall miss him. Mrs. Albert and I extend to his son and all his loved ones our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of Oklahoma's greatest statesmen, and a distinguished former member of this body, has left us.

In the death of the Honorable Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma has lost one of its most effective and able public servants and leaders.

As a member of this House, and later as a U.S. Senator, Elmer Thomas made many contributions to the progress of our country. He was an acknowledged expert on agriculture, on money, on water development, on Indian affairs, and on a host of other legislative subjects. He was an active and effective legislator who exerted great influence upon the actions of the Government throughout his service in Washington.

Elmer Thomas was a strong and loyal friend, and he was not afraid to speak out forcefully on controversial questions. An able orator with a phenomenal memory, he placed the imprint of his keen mind upon many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It was a great privilege to have known this distinguished American, and to have received the benefit of his wise counsel on more than one occasion.

I will miss Elmer Thomas, and his family is joined in this time of mourning by many who respected and loved him.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma has lost one of its foremost citizens, a public servant whose career has spanned the entire period of our existence as a State, in the passing of Senator Elmer Thomas.

The only Oklahoman ever elected four times to the Senate, he served in that body for 24 years, longer than any other man from our State.

Born on an Indiana farm in 1876, he was educated in the public schools and

was graduated from Central Normal College—now Canterbury—at Danville, Ind., and from DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

In 1900 he moved to Oklahoma, where he was admitted to the bar and began the practice of law at Oklahoma City. The next year he began his practice at Lawton, which was his home for the remaining 64 years of his life.

When Oklahoma became a State in 1907 Elmer Thomas was a member of the first State senate. There he served until 1920, when he won the Democratic nomination for Congressman from the Sixth Congressional District. He lost that year in the Harding landslide, but 2 years later he was renominated and elected, taking his seat in the 68th Congress.

After two terms in the House, Elmer Thomas was elected to the Senate in 1926, serving four terms. He won distinction as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, eventually as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, and as a forceful authority on monetary policy.

He was a pioneer in the water resources development of Oklahoma, and won authorization for many projects that still bring increasing benefits to our State. Keystone Dam, whose authorization he won before World War II was completed only recently.

After he was defeated for reelection in 1950 Senator Thomas practiced law in Washington until 1957, then he returned to Lawton to make his home. He became the author of three books, and maintained an alert, well-informed interest in the Government and economic development of our State.

It was my privilege to know him personally for many years and to have served with him in the 81st Congress.

All Oklahomans will join in expressing their sympathy to his family and in saluting the accomplishments of a distinguished career.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was very sad to hear of the passing of my good friend, John William Elmer Thomas—one of Oklahoma's best-known citizens.

Elmer Thomas and I were friends over a long period of years. He was a Democrat and I am a Republican; but this never in any way affected our friendship.

He was an exceptionally friendly and modest man, who devoted the major part of his life to public service for the betterment of Oklahoma. Starting with the first State senate in Oklahoma, where he served from 1907 to 1920, he followed by tours of duty in both the U.S. House of Representatives from 1923 to 1927, and the U.S. Senate from 1927 to 1951.

Few men are better known Oklahomans than Elmer, or served their State through more perilous times in the U.S. Congress, for Elmer was here during World War II.

I shall long remember this respected statesman and cherish our warm friendship; and I send my sincere condolences to his family at this time, and know that God will strengthen and sustain them in their hour of need.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and services of the late Senator Elmer Thomas.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES P. BRADLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5121) for the relief of James P. Bradley.

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

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORTH COUNTIES HYDROELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10097) for the relief of North Counties Hydroelectric Co.

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

H.R. 10097

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to North Counties Hydro-Electric Company of Illinois, the sum of $187,058, in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for damages to its powerplant and dam at Dayton, Illinois, sustained as the result of a dam built by the United States on the Illinois River, at Starved Rock near Ottawa, Illinois. The United States Court of Claims in Congressional Numbered 2-59 entitled North Counties Hydro-Electric Company, a corporation of Illinois against the United States (decided on April 16, 1965) held that the amount due the plaintiff from the United States is $187,058: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "for" insert "past and future."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLIAM JOHN CAMPBELL McCAUGHEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 450) for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey.

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

S. 450

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William John Campbell McCaughey may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of physical presence within the United States shall be required in addition to his physical presence within the United States since November 27, 1956.

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

DR. OTTO F. KERNBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1012) for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

POLA BODENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1111) for the relief of Pola Bodenstein.

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

S. 1111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pola Bodenstein may be issued a visa and

admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

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

ELIGIO CIARDIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1918) for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAXIE L. RUPERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2578) for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert.

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

H.R. 2578

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Maxie L. Rupert of Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,344, the amount of overpayments of salary between December 10, 1962, and June 23, 1963, resulting from a promotion in violation of section 1310(c) of the Act of November 1, 1951 (5 U.S.C. 43 note). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maxie L. Rupert, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. CLARA W. DOLLAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1873) for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LOUIS W. HANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1409) for the relief of Louis W. Hann.

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

H.R. 1409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis W. Hann, of Orange, New Jersey, the sum of $1,422.13 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for the amount he was required to pay to the United States for transporting the excess weight of his household goods from Stuttgart, Germany, to Orange, New Jersey, during 1961, after being improperly separated from his position as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ARTHUR HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6590) for the relief of Arthur Hill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOSEPH B. STEVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10338) for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARIA FINOCCHIARO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4211) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHIZUYO HOSHIZAKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4928) for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki.

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

H.R. 4928

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chizuyo Hoshizaki, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Chizuyo Hoshizaki shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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

HARVEY E. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8085) for the relief of Harvey E. Ward.

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

H.R. 8085

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby consents, for the purposes of the seventh clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, to the acceptance by Harvey E. Ward, United States Coast Guard, retired, of Taipei, Taiwan, from the State of Tasmania, Commonwealth of Australia, of the office and emolument of teacher in the Department of Education in such State during the calendar years 1960 through 1964.

SEC. 2. Said Harvey E. Ward is relieved of any liability to the United States which the Comptroller General (in the decision numbered B-154213) held arose from his receipt of United States Coast Guard retired pay in violation of the seventh clause of section 9 of article I of the Constitution. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harvey E. Ward an

amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the liability to the United States specified in section 2 of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4: Strike "seventh" and insert "eighth".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: On page 2, line 4, strike "seventh" and insert "eighth".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

S. SGT. ROBERT E. MARTIN, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8829) for the relief of S. Sgt. Robert E. Martin, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EDWARD F. MURZYN AND EDWARD J. O'BRIEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10403) for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. JAMES E. BAILEY, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10404) for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

H.R. 10404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel James E. Bailey, Junior, 7506A, United States Air Force (retired), Rural Route Number 2, Clarksville, Tennessee, the sum of $1,793.70 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire on January 15, 1964, at the Altus-Hollis Transport Company warehouse, Altus, Oklahoma, while the property was stored in the warehouse under a Government contract. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

COL. DONALD J. M. BLAKESLEE, AND LT. COL. ROBERT E. WAYNE, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10405) for the relief of Col. Donald J. M. Blakeslee and Lt. Col. Robert E. Wayne, U.S. Air Force.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. JACK F. OREND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4911) for the relief of Lt. Col. Jack F. Orend.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. LONETA HACKNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1484) for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney.

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

H.R. 1484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), Mrs. Loneta Hackney, Waco, Texas, widow of Charles B. Hackney, retired employee of the Veterans' Administration, shall be held and considered to be the wife and widow of the said Charles B. Hackney within the meaning of sections 1(h), 9(g), and 10(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(h), 2259(g), and 2260(a)), at and after the time of his retirement under such Act.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF AUTOMATIC STEADY STATE DISTRIBUTION MACHINE FOR UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7608) to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

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

H.R. 7608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF SHADOMASTER MEASURING PROJECTOR FOR UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9351) to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota.

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

H.R. 9351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, insert after "projector" the following; "(and its accompanying parts and equipment)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CRAIG COUNTERCURRENT DISTRIBUTION APPARATUS FOR COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9587) to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

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

H.R. 9587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus (and its accompanying parts and equipment) imported for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, which was entered during February 1963 pursuant to consumption entry 1136.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the articles described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF ELECTRICALLY DRIVEN ROTATING CHAIR FOR LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9588) to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.

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

H.R. 9588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one electrically driven rotating chair (and the control unit and other equipment accompanying such chair) for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, Louisiana.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 of the bill, after line 7, add the following:

"SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further calls of bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill S. 2084.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 312]

Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien
Andrews, George W.	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara, Ill.
	Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolton	Hamilton	Powell
Bonner	Hanna	Roosevelt
Buchanan	Harris	Roudebush
Burton, Utah	Herlong	Roybal
Cabell	Holifield	St Germain
Clevenger	Holland	Senner
Colmer	Hosmer	Smith, Iowa
Cramer	Jarman	Springer
Diggs	Lindsay	Stephens
Dow	Long, La.	Stratton
Dowdy	McDowell	Thomas
Farnsley	Madden	Thompson, Tex.
Farnum	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Fino	Miller	Whitener
Ford, William D.	Morton	
	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill—S. 4—to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1022)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words "SECTION 1." a new subsection (a) as follows:

"'(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.'

"(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c), respectively.

"(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called "Secretary") shall administer this Act through the Administration created by section 2 of this Act, and with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct (1) the head of such Administration in administering this Act and (2) the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe.'

"(b) There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631) shall be applicable to such additional Assistant Secretary to the same extent as they are applicable to the Assistant Secretaries authorized by that section. Paragraph (17) of section 303(d) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 418) is amended by striking out '(5)' before the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof '(6)'.

"SEC. 2. (a) Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4, and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 14, as sections 7 through 16, respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"'FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administration"). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from the personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions; and he may delegate any of his functions to, or otherwise authorize their performance by, any officer or employee of, or assigned or detailed to, the Administration.'

"(b) Subject to such requirements as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, any commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who, on the day before the effective date of the establishment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, was, as such officer, performing functions

relating to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act may acquire competitive civil service status and be transferred to a classified position in the Administration if he so transfers within six months (or such further period as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may find necessary in individual cases) after such effective date. No commissioned officer of the Public Health Service may be transferred to the Administration under this section if he does not consent to such transfer. As used in this section, the term 'transferring officer' means an officer transferred in accordance with this subsection.

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund, on behalf of and to the credit of each transferring officer, an amount equal to that which such individual would be required to deposit in such fund to cover the years of service credited to him for purposes of his retirement as a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service to the date of his transfer as provided in subsection (b), but only to the extent that such service is otherwise creditable under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The amount so required to be deposited with respect to any transferring officer shall be computed on the basis of the sum of his basic pay, allowance for quarters, and allowance for subsistence and, in the case of a medical officer, his special pay, during the years of service so creditable, including all such years after June 30, 1960.

"(2) The deposits which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to make under this subsection with respect to any transferring officer shall be made within two years after the date of his transfer as provided in subsection (b), and the amounts due under this subsection shall include interest computed from the period of service credited to the date of payment in accordance with section 4(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2254(e)).

"(d) All past service of a transferring officer as a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service shall be considered as civilian service for all purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act, effective as of the date any such transferring officer acquires civil service status as an employee of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; however, no transferring officer may become entitled to benefits under both the Civil Service Retirement Act and title II of the Social Security Act based on service as such a commissioned officer performed after 1956, but the individual (or his survivors) may irrevocably elect to waive benefit credit for the service under one Act to secure credit under the other.

"(e) A transferring officer on whose behalf a deposit is required to be made by subsection (c) and who, after transfer to a classified position in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration under subsection (b), is separated from Federal service or transfers to a position not covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act, shall not be entitled, nor shall his survivors be entitled, to a refund of any amount deposited on his behalf in accordance with this section. In the event he transfers, after transfer under subsection (b), to a position covered by another Government staff retirement system under which credit is allowable for service with respect to which a deposit is required under subsection (c), no credit shall be allowed under the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to such service.

"(f) Each transferring officer who prior to January 1, 1957, was insured pursuant to the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and who subsequently waived such insurance, shall be entitled to become insured under such Act upon his transfer to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration regardless of age and insurability.

"(g) Any commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who, pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, is transferred to a position in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration which is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive a salary rate of the General Schedule grade of such position which is nearest to but not less than the sum of (1) basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances, and, in the case of a medical officer, special pay, to which he was entitled as a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service on the day immediately preceding his transfer, and (2) an amount equal to the equalization factor (as defined in this subsection); but in no event shall the rate so established exceed the maximum rate of such grade. As used in this section, the term 'equalization factor' means an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the sum of (A) 6½ per centum of such basic pay and (B) the amount of Federal income tax which the transferring officer, had he remained a commissioned officer, would have been required to pay on such allowances for quarters and subsistence for the taxable year then current if they had not been tax free.

"(h) A transferring officer who has had one or more years of commissioned service in the Public Health Service immediately prior to his transfer under subsection (b) shall, on the date of such transfer, be credited with thirteeen days of sick leave.

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any commissioned officer of the United States Public Health Service with twenty-five or more years of service who has held the temporary rank of Assistant Surgeon General in the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the United States Public Health Service for three or more years and whose position and duties are affected by this Act, may, with the approval of the President, voluntarily retire from the United States Public Health Service with the same retirement benefits that would accrue to him if he had held the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for a period of four years or more if he so retires within ninety days of the date of the establishment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

"(j) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to restrict or in any way limit the head of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in matters of organization or in otherwise carrying out his duties under section 2 of this Act as he deems appropriate to the discharge of the functions of such Administration.

"(k) The Surgeon General shall be consulted by the head of the Administration on the public health aspects relating to water pollution over which the head of such Administration has administrative responsibility.

"SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

"'GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"'SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to new or improved methods of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, except that not to exceed 25 per centum of the total amount appropriated under authority of this section for any fiscal year may be expended under authority of this sentence during such fiscal year.

"'(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

"'(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purposes of this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant or contract shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out '$600,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,200,000,'.

"(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out '$2,400,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,800,000,'.

"(c) Subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The limitations of $1,200,000 and $4,800,000 imposed by clause (2) of this subsection shall not apply in the case of grants made under this section from funds allocated under the third sentence of subsection (c) of this section if the State agrees to match equally all Federal grants made from such allocation for projects in such State.'

"(d)(1) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out 'for any fiscal year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for each fiscal year ending on or before June 30, 1965, and the first $100,000,000 appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1965,'.

"(2) Subsection (c) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by inserting immediately after the period at the end of the second sentence thereof the following: 'All sums in excess of $100,000,000 appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1965, shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all States.'

"(3) The third sentence of subsection (c) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out 'the preceding sentence' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the two preceding sentences'.

"(4) The next to the last sentence of subsection (c) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out 'and third' and inserting in lieu thereof ', third, and fourth'.

"(e) The last sentence of subsection (d) of such redesignated section 8 is amended

to read as follows: 'Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. At least 50 per centum of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year ending on or before June 30, 1965, and at least 50 per centum of the first $100,000,000 so appropriated for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1965, shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of one hundred and twenty-five thousand population or under.'

"(f) Subsection (d) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out '$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.'

"(g) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z—15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).'

"(h) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

"'(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under subsection (b) of this section by an additional 10 per centum of the amount of such grant for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "metropolitan area" means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c)(1) If the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency files, within one year after the date of enactment of this subsection, a letter of intent that such State, after public hearings, will before June 30, 1967, adopt (A) water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within such State, and (B) a plan for the implementation and enforcement of the water quality criteria adopted, and if such criteria and plan are established in accordance with the letter of intent, and if the Secretary determines that such State criteria and plan are consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection, such State criteria and plan shall thereafter be the water quality standards applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

"'(2) If a State does not (A) file a letter of intent or (B) establish water quality standards in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection, or if the Secretary or the Governor of any State affected by water quality standards established pursuant to this subsection desires a revision in such standards, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. If, within six months from the date the Secretary publishes such regulations, the State has not adopted water quality standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection, or a petition for public hearing has not been filed under paragraph (4) of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate such standards.

"'(3) Standards of quality established pursuant to this subsection shall be such as to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing such standards the Secretary, the Hearing Board, or the appropriate State authority shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

"'(4) If at any time prior to 30 days after standards have been promulgated under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Governor of any State affected by such standards petitions the Secretary for a hearing, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the water quality standards will take effect, before a Hearing Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State which would be affected by such standards shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board. The Department of Commerce and other affected Federal departments and agencies shall each be given an opportunity to select a member of the Hearing Board and not less than a majority of the Hearing Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while participating in the hearing conducted by such Hearing Board or otherwise engaged on the work of such Hearing Board, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notice of such hearing shall be published in the Federal Register and given to the State water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies and municipalities involved at least 30 days prior to the date of such hearing. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Hearing Board shall make findings as to whether the standards published or promulgated by the Secretary should be approved or modified and transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the Hearing Board approves the standards as published or promulgated by the Secretary, the standards shall take effect on receipt by the Secretary of the Hearing Board's recommendations. If the Hearing Board recommends modifications in the standards as published or promulgated by the Secretary, the Secretary shall promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards of water quality in accordance with the Hearing Board's recommendations which will become effective immediately upon promulgation.

"'(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters or portions thereof, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards established under this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (g) of this section, except that at least 180 days before any abatement action is initiated under either paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (g) as authorized by this subsection, the Secretary shall notify the violators and other interested parties of the violation of such standards. In any suit brought under the provisions of this subsection the court shall receive in evidence a transcript of the proceedings of the conference and hearing provided for in this subsection, together with the recommendations of the conference and Hearing Board and the recommendations and standards promulgated by the Secretary, and such additional evidence, including that relating to the alleged violation of the standards, as it deems necessary to a complete review of the standards and to a determination of all other issues relating to the alleged violation. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with such standards, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment and orders enforcing such judgment as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"'(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (A) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (B) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act.

"'(7) In connection with any hearings under this section no witness or any other person shall be required to divulge trade secrets or secret processes.'

"(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (*d*) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: '; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities.'

"SEC. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"'(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.'

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 6(b)(4).' as contained

therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 8(b)(4).'.

"(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 5' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 7'.

"(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (g)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (h)'.

"(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'subsection (e)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (f)'.

"(e) Section 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out 'section 8(c)(3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(d)(3)' and by striking out 'section 8(e)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 10(f)'.

"SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the 'Water Quality Act of 1965'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBT. E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
FRANK E. MOSS,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompaning conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for technical and clerical corrections and changes.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment in subsection (b) of the first section thereof provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in administering this act.

The conference substitute makes certain technical revisions in the language establishing this additional Assistant Secretary necessary because of the enactment of the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965. These amendments are technical in nature only.

The conferees wish to indicate the importance they believe should be placed on this reorganization of the water pollution control program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare This new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Administrator of the new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration should be individuals of the highest caliber with the finest possible background in the field of water pollution, so that this program can be accelerated and real progress can begin to be made in reducing the pollution of the streams of this Nation.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

The Senate bill in subsection (b) of section 5 amends redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by adding thereto a new subsection (c) which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. These standards are to be formulated in accordance with administrative procedures calling for notice and public hearing, consultation with affected Federal, State, interstate, and local interests, and are required to be such as to protect the public health or welfare and otherwise generally to enhance the quality and value of interstate waters. These standards would also be subject to revision either by the Secretary on his own motion or when petitioned for revision by the Governor of any affected State. The same procedure for hearing and consultation would be followed in revisions as when standards were originally being formulated. The Senate bill further directs the Secretary to promulgate standards only if the appropriate State and interstate agencies have not developed standards which he finds consistent with the purposes of the section within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so. Once the Secretary has promulgated water quality standards or there have been standards established by State or interstate agencies consistent with the section, any discharge of matter which reduces the quality of the waters below the established standards is made subject to abatement under the existing enforcement procedures provided in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Subsection (a) of section 5 of the House amendment amends redesignated section 7 (f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by adding at the end thereof a new clause (7) which provides that each State, within 90 days after the date of enactment of the bill, is to file with the Secretary a letter of intent that such State will establish water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within its jurisdiction on or before June 30, 1967. Failure to file such a letter of intent would preclude the State from receiving any further funds under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act until such time as such a letter is filed.

Section 5(a) of the proposed conference substitute would amend redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to add to that section a new subsection (c).

Paragraph (1) of this new subsection provides that if the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency files within 1 year after date of enactment of the subsection a letter of intent that such State after public hearings will before June 30, 1967, adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within such State and a plan to implement and enforce such criteria and if the Secretary determines that such criteria and plan are consistent with paragraph (3) of the subsection, then the State criteria and plan will thereafter be the water quality standards applicable to those interstate waters or portions thereof.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection provides that if a State does not file a letter of intent or establish water quality standards under paragraph (1) or if the Secretary or Governor of any affected State wants a revision of the standards then the Secretary may after having given a reasonable notice and having had a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities, and affected industries, prepare and publish regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. The Secretary may promulgate standards 6 months after the date he publishes his regulations unless within that period the State has adopted water quality standards which the Secretary finds to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection or a petition for a public hearing has been filed under paragraph (4) of this subsection.

Paragraph (4) of this subsection provides that if the Governor of any State affected by the standards petitions the Secretary for a hearing at any time after the regulations have been published and prior to 30 days after standards have been promulgated under paragraph (2) the Secretary is required to call a public hearing. This public hearing is to be held in or near one or more of the places where the standards will take effect and is to be before a hearing board consisting of at least five persons. The members of the hearing board are to be appointed by the Secretary. However, each affected State may select one member and the Department of Commerce and other affected agencies may each select one member. There is a further restriction that at least a majority of the hearing board must be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The conferees expect that the Secretary will appoint at least one public member of each hearing board who will be from the area to be directly affected by the standards. Further, the conferees intend that the Secretary in appointing hearing boards will insure a proper balance between all affected interests. Paragraph (4) provides that members of the hearing board who are not officers or employees of the United States will receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $100 per diem as well as travel expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business all in accordance with provisions of applicable law. Notice of the public hearing is to be published in the Federal Register and is to be given to the State water pollution agencies, interstate agencies, and municipalities involved at least 30 days before the hearing. After the evidence has been presented and on the basis thereof the hearing board is required to make findings as to whether the Secretary's standards should be approved or modified, and to transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the hearing board approves the standards as published or promulgated, they take effect when the Secretary receives the hearing board's recommendations. If modifications are recommended the Secretary is required to promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards in accordance with the recommendations and these revised regulations will take effect immediately upon their promulgation.

Paragraph (5) of the new subsection provides that the discharge of matter into interstate waters or portions thereof which reduce their quality below the applicable standard (whether the matter is discharged directly into the waters or reaches the waters after discharging into tributaries thereof) is subject to abatement in accordance with either paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (g)

of this section whichever of those paragraphs is applicable. However, before abatement is initiated under either paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (g) the Secretary is required to notify the violators and other interested parties of the violation of the standards and at least 180 days must elapse so that there may be voluntary compliance. The conferees intend that during such period the Secretary should afford an opportunity for an informal hearing before himself or such hearing officer or board as he may appoint relative to the alleged violation of standards, upon the request of any affected State, alleged violator, or other interested party, so that if possible there can be voluntary agreement reached during this period, thus eliminating the necessity for suit. In any suit brought to secure abatement of pollution under this subsection the court is required to receive in evidence a transcript of the conference and hearing provided for in this subsection, the recommendations of the conference and the hearing board and the recommendations and standards promulgated by the Secretary and such additional evidence including that related to the alleged violation of the standards as the court deems necessary to a complete review of the standards as well as a determination of all other issues relating to the alleged violation. The court is given jurisdiction to enter whatever judgment and orders the public interest and equities of the case may require after having given due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with the applicable standards. The existing enforcement procedures in the present Water Pollution Control Act which consist of three stages, conference, public hearings, and court action, will continue to be applicable for enforcing the abatement of pollution which endangers the health or welfare of persons.

Paragraph (3) of this subsection requires standards of water quality established pursuant to this subsection to be such as to protect the public health or welfare, enhance water quality and generally to serve the purposes of the Act. In establishing such standards the Secretary, Hearing Board, or State, as the case may be, is required to take into consideration their use and value for water supply, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreation, agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

Paragraph (6) of this subsection provides that this subsection is not to prevent the application of section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in any case to which subsection (a) of section 10 would otherwise be applicable, or to extend Federal jurisdiction over water if not otherwise authorized by this Act.

Paragraph (7) of this subsection prohibits any witness or other person from being required to divulge in connection with any hearing under this section any trade secrets or secret processes.

SUBPENA POWER IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the House amendment amends redesignated section 10(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to add a new sentence which authorizes the Secretary in an enforcement action to administer oaths and to compel the presence and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence by the issuance of subpenas. It further provides that no person would be required to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and provide for payment of witness fees, mileage, and for the enforcement of subpenas by district courts of the United States.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Section 7 of the proposed conference substitute contains a number of technical conforming changes in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act made necessary by the amendments otherwise made by the conference substitute.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBT. E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we discuss today the very important, conclusive, and the final step on a very important piece of legislation which deals with the control and reduction and, if possible, prevention or at least minimizing the ever-increasing degree of pollution of our water resources of this great country of ours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had good law which this House initially asked for and received back in 1956. This law was subsequently amended in 1961 and this year amended by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I can report to the Members of the House I am pleased to state that practically all of the version of the House bill was agreed to by the conferees of the other body.

But, Mr. Speaker, we did have a major issue in dispute on the extremely important but likewise complex and complicated and involved matter of establishing standards. That was the major point of dispute. It took us almost 4 months to resolve that dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to state before my colleagues and for the public record, that the compromise which we have worked out on this very difficult matter of standards involving the great difference between the House version and the version in the other body as we worked it out, is not only sound, it is not only fair, but it is workable and practical and in my own judgment it makes a better bill than either of the original two bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come here and report our agreement.

This legislation, as you are all well aware, has been the subject of considerable discussion over the past several months. We have been meeting with the other body formally and informally over the past several months in an effort to iron out the differences between the two versions of the legislation. I believe this has been most successfully accomplished and the conference report we present you today is one which will not only provide authorizations to further continue our fight against the elimination of the pollution in our streams and lakes in all sections of the country, but will, at the same time, provide fair treatment to all those who are affected by this legislation. I believe it is a stronger bill, a more equitable bill, than either of the original two versions. By this I mean the States, cities, towns, the private industries, and individuals themselves, all of whom, as you know, are constant users of our most precious natural resource—water.

Before I continue with my comments on S. 4, might I pay particular tribute to my colleagues on the conference, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the Committee on Public Works; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and the two minority members of the conference who contributed so much to the successful completion of what has been a most difficult and trying time, the gentleman from Florida, the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. CRAMER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

This conference report I present to you today is one that has been worked out most carefully.

It embodies, I believe, the best features of the legislation as it passed the House and the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to refresh the Members of the House with reference to this legislation, they may recall that in the House version when it came to the matter of standards, the House bill had merely this language: We directed that the States should file with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a letter of intent within 90 days after the enactment of this piece of legislation and that on or before June 30, 1967, approximately 2 years hence, that the States establish water quality criteria to be applicable to interstate waters within the States. If they do not file this letter of intent, we had a penalty provision which provided that any Federal assistance to any State or municipal organizations would be cut off.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate version called for the establishment of standards by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare almost immediately. Oh, yes, we had been to conference and had had an informal type of huddle between the conferees and the Federal agencies involved, as well as with the States and private industry and other private parties with reference to the question of whether the Secretary on his own would establish these standards and proceed promptly to enforce them under the enforcement provisions contained in the existing law. So, here, we were granting almost total power to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish standards on a very important and complex issue, and the standards would be promulgated almost immediately, and thereupon enforced.

As a result of the hard fought conference, we now give the States 1 year to write a letter of intent that they will by June of 1967 establish water quality criteria. If after that period of time the State does establish water quality criteria satisfactory to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as he sees it, to meet the objectives of this act, then they shall become the standard for the State.

Second. If a State does not act or if it has water quality criteria which the Secretary of HEW feels are inferior or not adequate to accomplish the purposes of the act, then the Secretary of HEW, after an informal conference with all the parties concerned, the Federal agencies, the State agencies, and individual people, will publish—and do remember this—standards for the given area or the State.

The State is then given 6 months to develop acceptable standards of their own. If they do so, all well and good. If they do not, then the Secretary after 6 months will promulgate his published standards, as I say, after a 6-month period. Even though these standards promulgated by the Secretary of HEW are made, the Governor of any State may ask for a revision of the standards any time during the 6-month period and up to the 30 days after the Secretary has promulgated the standards. If the Governor asks for revision then the Secretary must grant a hearing. In short, a Governor can ask for a hearing and the Secretary must grant a hearing. This is before a quasi-official board, and a record of all proceedings is kept.

The Senate side accepted the House version of how the board would be appointed. We insisted that the board be appointed by the Secretary rather than the President. The board shall have not less than five members. The membership on the hearing board must be one that has broad balance of representation. Each and all of the States involved in a hearing would appoint their own respective members to the board. The Department of Commerce may appoint its member of the board, and other interested or affected or participant Federal agencies or any other State agency would have their representatives, and a public member would be on the board also, and less than a majority of the members may be employees of the Department of HEW.

In short, we have made adequate provision for fair representation on the board, and the board shall be as representative as possible of a given area, and the hearings must be held in that area.

This hearing board, after hearing all of the evidence from all parties concerned, can then do either one of two things: Approve the standards and recommend approval at the same time to the Secretary, whereupon he may promulgate them and enforce them. Or the board may modify the proposed standards. These modifications are reported back with a recommendation to the Secretary of HEW. He shall conform and comply with these recommendations of the hearing board and promulgate the standards. We have a process for establishing standards which will be a joint operation at which not only the Federal Government and its agencies, other than the Secretary of HEW, shall be represented, but the States affected shall be represented, private industry shall be represented, the general public shall be represented. In fact, all members affected by the standards are represented on this board, and the recommendations of the board shall govern the final decision of HEW.

All of this would be under the heading, Mr. Speaker, of establishing standards.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way from the Senate's Secretary setting standards stalemate. We on the House side have receded from the penalty section for noncompliance and have given the States a full year rather than the 90 days restriction for the filing of the letter of intent. Thanks to the diligent work of both Houses, we have before us a procedure that brings the States into full participation in establishing criteria that after June 30, 1967, could become standards.

Let it not be said that the States have not been given full power to establish for themselves a quality of clean water that they can truly be proud of. Let the RECORD also show that this standard setting process is greatly fortified by the fact that the Governor of the State can petition to have the standards revised and the Secretary must then submit to a hearing board and this hearing board's determination will be final. In short, the States, municipalities, industries, and all other affected parties have a full and fair opportunity to be heard in this very practical and workable procedure that will do much to prevent the pollution of our Nation's waters. Instead of just rolling back pollution that already exists, this procedure serves as a preventive measure. It will serve to prevent pollution before it happens.

From here on, of course, once these standards have been promulgated, then you have the second phase, which is enforcement.

If a standard is violated, and this material is discharged into the waters which would further deteriorate the waters, according to the provisions of the act he may institute enforcement proceedings. However, before any abatement action is initiated the violator or alleged violator is given 6 months for voluntary compliance. Again, you will note in the statement of the managers on the part of the House the alleged violator or violators will not only be given this time for compliance, but will be given full opportunity to meet with and to discuss with either the Secretary or his responsible representative to see if they can work out an arrangement or statement so that an agreeable solution may be arrived at without going into court or instituting a suit.

So we do believe we have worked out a fair and yet effective manner of requiring standards and enforcing those standards. We do it so that the Federal Government with the States and municipalities and public entities as well as private industries and other persons directly interested have a share in the participation because in my own opinion there is no question whatsoever that with the rapidly increasing problem of pollution which is already of critical proportions in many, many large river basins in different areas of the country, this problem will not be coped with effectively and it will not be solved unless we have a massive joint effort and we think that this procedure that both bodies have agreed upon will provide the opportunity for that kind of effort.

In concluding I merely want to say, and I would like to refresh your memory about how urgent this whole problem is. Time is rapidly running out. In the eastern half of the United States alone, 15 years ago, and I was here in the House then in 1950, water consumption was about 100 billion gallons a day. That is 15 years ago. Now we are in the 1965, and as we look ahead to the year 1980, 15 years from today, the water consumption in use in the eastern half of the United States will increase fourfold from 100 billion gallons of water in 1950—and we are at the half-way point, 15 years later—and projecting into the future 15 years hence—it will be 400 billion gallons or a 400-percent increase.

Now the key to this program that we provide for in this bill is that now we have for the first time placed the emphasis where it belongs in trying to solve this problem, and that is on the prevention and minimizing as much as possible this pollution before it occurs.

We know now and we will know even better after more scientific and technical data is brought in from our respective regional water research laboratories what can and ought to be done as to the nature of pollutants and how to cope with them. When we know that pollution is going to occur in a given area just as surely as the sands run out of an hourglass and when today we know that we will have a very serious pollution problem 10 or 20 years from now, why wait for that to happen when we can have intelligent, systematic, preventive, effective measures to begin now to encourage and make possible orderly utilization of the water and yet provide for its preservation and conservation for the many uses and the many demands which will be made for that water in the years to come.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the distinguished gentleman and the father of this legislation knows, my district stretches about 20 miles along the shores of Lake Erie, probably known as the most severely polluted major body of water. This subject of standards has been one of intense interest in New York as well as throughout the country. It seems to me that the compromise reached by the conferees on this matter as to the criteria of standards is eminently fair and reasonable and will accomplish the objectives that the gentleman has in mind. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. There is no question in my mind that the program will be very effective. As I said earlier, it will bring into play all the parties involved and not merely the Federal agency. The program is definitely needed. There is no question whatsoever that it will be a most effective and workable program. It will give full opportunity for all parties to participate, and particularly enable them to show a little more initiative than they have. Some have done an excellent job, many fairly well, and unfortunately too many not well at all. The program will give them a full opportunity to get on the move in 2 years and then from then on the momentum will gather and we will proceed full steam ahead. I am confident that we can handle this needed program.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota on the excellent job which the conference committee has done in working out a system whereby we can have Federal standards and State participation. The result is a very fine compromise.

However, I wondered whether it will be necessary to delay the operation of the program until June 30, 1967, when these standards will be put into effect, or will they be put into effect before that date?

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no reason for delay. We are confident that the States will comply by establishing their own water quality criteria just as soon as physically possible. We on the House side felt very strongly that the States ought to be given time to get their own houses in order and get on the way rather than to lower the boom on them now with arbitrary Federal standards.

We do not today have enough information really to come up with practical and reasonable standards. So to prevent unfair or capricious standards by the Federal Government, the States were brought into the picture and given a chance to establish for themselves water quality criteria. By soliciting their cooperation the Federal program is made 50 times as strong as it would be without the participation of the States. Meanwhile, we are developing further information so that 2 years hence, working with the States, the agencies of the Federal Government, the municipalities, and the industry, we will be able to come to an agreement and establish the necessary hearing board mechanism and provide bona fide, ironclad, and yet effective, realistic, and workable standards. So we shall lose no time.

Mr. OTTINGER. The 6 months participation for the States promulgating standards would apply after June 30?

Mr. BLATNIK. No; it could apply before that. On failure of a State to file a letter of intent within a year of enactment of this legislation, the Secretary could publish standards and at the end of 6 months if the State still has not acted he could promulgate them.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the standard-setting procedures and the advances made in the enforcement section that includes a full and complete court review of the standards, the House prevailed in other equally important sections of the bill. The Senate side accepted our $50 million annual increase in construction grants. It also accepted our dollar increase version of individual and multicommunity construction projects. This money is badly needed if we are to meet the backlog of projects.

Again my personal thanks for the generous support over these long months. At last we have a measure that strikes a happy balance between strong controls and fair procedures.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, who is a very good friend and an able member of the committee, I am pleased to add.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate my distinguished subcommittee chairman for the superb job that he had done in working out this compromise, he and the other members of the conference committee, with the other body, and bringing before this body today a conference report which is excellent, one which is fair, and one which I think more than anything else is a tribute to the distinguished gentleman now in the well for his long suffering, his patience, and his perseverance.

We have here a conference report that I think will have the cooperation of the States, the municipalities, and the industry involved. I want also to praise the minority for their splendid cooperation during the long months it took to develop this important legislation.

This is a good conference report. It is a good bill. Again I wish to congratulate, commend, and thank my distinguished subcommittee chairman for a magnificent job.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the leader of the minority members of the committee on conference.

As I indicated earlier, I wish to make official acknowledgment and public recognition of the constructive and cooperative participation and assistance on the part of the minority members of the conference, without whose assistance, cooperation, and work on this controversial matter, the result would have been impossible. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not repeat those matters discussed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Let me say that I am glad this conference has finally resolved its differences. This was probably one of the longest conferences on record in which agreement was finally reached. There were many weeks between the appointment of conferees and final conference action. I believe the long lapse of time indicates the difficulty of the problems with which we were concerned.

These problems principally involved the one issue of whether Federal water quality standards should be adopted relating to the interstate streams and portions thereof in the United States, or whether the States should retain jurisdiction over the determination of those water quality standards subject to possible review by the Secretary.

Let me say at the outset, I do not intend to oppose the conference report. I signed the conference report. However, if I had been writing the bill which was drafted relating to the standards section in conference, I would have written it differently than it is before us. Nevertheless I believe it is as good a compromise as we could obtain between the Senate and House versions of the legislation.

I believe some significant concessions were made by the other body in the drafts we had before us for consideration, and I will mention those in just a moment. There were a sufficiently large number of concessions and significant concessions, including the subject matter written into the conference report itself, made by the other body, so that I feel I can support the conference report with that language written into that report, so long as the Secretary abides by the language written into that report.

I specifically refer to pages 12 and 13 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House, more specifically to the language at the bottom of page 12. This language relates to what will happen after the standards are set and a given industry is brought in for violation thereof. The question is this: What will then happen?

The Secretary will first decide in his mind that a violation has occurred. The question I was concerned about, in the conference, is that then the Secretary has the power to bring the party, the business, and the State into court, after a lapse of a 6-month period. The 6 months was conceded in conference. The 6 months is intended to give the State and the local industry involved, or whoever may be a violator, an opportunity to conform to the Secretary's demands.

The thing which disturbed me was that once these standards were set, the Secretary could arbitrarily, if he saw fit to do so, bring not only the industry involved but also the State agency as well into court. The objection I had to that procedure was that there was nothing specifically provided to permit the State agency to conform. If water pollution control is going to be a partnership approach, then there must be cooperation with the State and local governments by the Federal agency. That makes it a partnership approach, and in my opinion, that is the only way this program can succeed. To be a partnership, the violator and/or the State agency has to be given an opportunity for a hearing of some nature with the Secretary before a final determination by the Secretary to file suit, through the Attorney General, for the violation can be made.

Appropriate language has been written into the conference report. I had hoped it would be in the language of the bill we are actually considering, but instead it is in the conference report. If it is lived up to, I believe it will meet that objection.

The language states:

> The conferees intend that during such period the Secretary should afford an opportunity for an informal hearing before himself or such hearing officer or board as he may appoint relative to the alleged violation of standards, upon the request of any affected State, alleged violator, or other interested party, so that if possible there can be voluntary agreement reached during this period, thus eliminating the necessity for suit.

That provision helps on that situation. Then we come to the next question.

If we are to have a court review—and this is a question we are faced with in all court review instances—what kind of a court review is it to be?

Is it going to be under the Administrative Procedure Act, with the decision of the administrative agency presumed to

be proper, and with the weight of overturning the decision on the opposing party, that is, the State or the violator in this instance, he having to prove the indiscretion? No, that is not what we wrote into this in the way of judicial review. This is a complete judicial review. I wish the gentleman from Minnesota would give me his attention relating to these points, because I hope we will have agreement in the debate here as well as the agreement which appears in the House report of the conferees. It is the intention that there be informal hearings during the 6-month period of compliance where voluntary compliance is permitted, following the finding of the Secretary that he believes a violation has occurred. It is the intention before the Secretary files a suit that informal hearings be held so that the State agency or the violator have a chance to present their case and thus determine whether a court action would follow.

Mr. BLATNIK. If the gentleman will yield, that was the clear and unequivocal opinion of all of the three majority members of the conferees.

Mr. CRAMER. Then, may I ask this one other question on judicial review? As is stated in this report of the managers on the part of the House, is it not true the intention of the House conferees was to write in a full and complete judicial review including the question of all standards that have been established that might affect that industry? They are all subject to review when the question of a violation is raised even though the specific standard which is alleged to have been violated will be included, but in addition to that all other standards that might affect that industry likewise will be subject to review as to their reasonableness?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I wanted to make sure that is on the RECORD, because those two points, I think, are the two principal points that tied up the conferees for this lengthy period. I am glad to get it on the RECORD that that is clear. The conferees also got a concession out of the other body to the effect that when these standards are determined by the Secretary after consultation with the States he shall then publish them in the Federal Register and over a period of time the State shall have an opportunity to be heard before, first, a conference, and then the standards are promulgated. Thirty days thereafter the States can ask for a hearing before an official hearing board, if they disagree. That is the protection given to the States, the local communities, and the industries involved. That hearing board, it was proposed in the draft we had before us, was to be appointed by the President. The other body made the concession that it should be appointed by the Secretary. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, sir. That is certainly correct.

Mr. CRAMER. This protection to the State and the local violator or the proposed possible prospective violator is through the appointment of a hearing board. That hearing board is appointed by the Secretary of HEW and not the President of the United States. We also stated that each State affected may not recommend, as was in the draft language, but select.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. Select their members.

Mr. CRAMER. There is no question from the standpoint of legislative history and intent that the State to be affected has the right to membership on the hearing board which determines the reasonableness of the standards after they are published in the Federal Register. Is that not correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAMER. That board has the power to modify its proposed regulations. Is that not correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The Secretary must issue regulations carrying out the hearing board's—not his but the hearing board's—determination?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. Yes, it is.

Mr. CRAMER. I just want to point out one or two other matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. We on this side of the aisle have been insisting—we did when we had the question of the additional $50 million authorization a few years ago, and we now have $50 million more in this legislation—if this program is going to succeed, that the States should be encouraged to help to match these additional Federal funds. There was a provision written into the House bill which, incidentally, passed unanimously, that required the States to match Federal funds for the construction of sewage treatment works, if the States wanted to go above the ceiling set in the proposed legislation. That provision is retained in the House-Senate conference. Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that I support the conference report. It took a long time to work it out. I think it is probably the best we could do in protecting the rights of the States and the industries that might be involved and giving them the proper opportunity to be heard.

I will say that the minority and the majority were given an opportunity on this legislation to work their will without the interference of the White House and the executive branch of the Government. The conferees of the House and Senate did an outstanding job in coming up with a bill that will do the job and not work undue hardships. This is a tough problem. It is a problem we have to meet. We are meeting our responsibility with this conference report, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate that in another matter involving even more money which is before the Committee on Public Works, involving $160 million a year and this water pollution legislation only involves $150 million a year and I am now talking about highway beautification, that we in this body are not likewise being given an opportunity to consider and determine the matter on its merits, in trying to get a consensus between the majority and the minority as between what is right and wrong. I am referring, as I said, to the matter of highway beautification. I think that the inability of a committee to work its own will is wrong.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I said when this bill was before us earlier this year that it was a tremendous step forward, but I was disappointed that it did not go further. Today I think on the question of the establishment of water standards the chairman and the conferees on both sides of the aisle are to be congratulated for bringing back a stronger bill—though I can still foresee a possible delay in excess of 2½ years before standards are set. This is a delay the Nation can ill afford.

Mr. Speaker, for years we have been on a treadmill. As fast as we go, we are still unable or barely able to stay up with the increased extent of the problem. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this subject, I was disappointed last spring to learn that the maximum authorization for Federal grants for municipal sewer systems was only $100 million. It would take a full authorization of $200 million Federal dollars to meet the demands of the municipalities for the construction of sewer systems in cases where local bonding authority for the local contribution already exists.

I ask the chairman, is it not true that this bill increases the authorization from $100 million to $150 million?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct; that is a 50-percent increase.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I am delighted with the increase. I am disappointed that it isn't greater, when we know what must be done and know how to do it—as we do here—and when the threat of failure is so great—as it is in the case of water pollution—we cannot justify doing less than our best. I intend to press for the appropriation of the full authorization in the appropriation subcommittee on which I serve. I hope that these funds, together with those that will be appropriated in support of related programs authorized by the new housing bill and the Economic Redevelopment Act, will do the job which must be done.

Mr. Speaker, the name of JOHN BLATNIK has always been in the forefront of the battle for pure water. This bill adds further honor to an already honored name.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], who played a most effective role in working out this compromise arrangement.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. The conferees worked long and hard in an effort to arrive at a reasonable and effective compromise between the House- and Senate-passed bills. We believe that this conference report does represent

such a reasonable and equitable compromise.

Basically, we have a most serious problem facing the Nation in the field of water pollution. That problem is that the supply of water in our streams remains approximately the same; in fact, in some areas right now it has been reduced. But the sources of pollution have been going up steadily year by year as our population increases and as the size of our cities increases, and as the number of our industries increases. Therefore, the potential sources of pollution have been increasing each year and our streams are in greater and greater danger of being polluted to a point where their natural beauty will be seriously adversely affected.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to meet this issue head on and to endeavor to take steps that will result in an improvement in the quality of our streams.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives recognition to the historic division of power between the Federal Government and the State governments in this field. This bill applies to interstate streams, streams in which the Federal Government has a proper interest under the Constitution of the United States.

It provides that the States will have the first opportunity to establish criteria for these streams that will meet reasonable standards. But if those States do not exercise that first opportunity to establish criteria that will meet reasonable standards, then this bill for the first time gives the Secretary of the Department of Commerce the power to establish such standards and to promulgate those standards and to enforce those standards. This is only right and proper because the Federal Government has a legitimate interest under the Constitution in interstate streams.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another extremely important phase of this bill is the allocation of $20 million for research and demonstration projects dealing with sewers that handle both sewage and also storm drainage.

In this field we have many problems throughout the United States and many of our cities have inadequate sewer systems today or combinations of sewers which also have to handle storm waters. Many of these systems are inadequate. When serious storms occur the amount of storm water coming into those sewer systems is such that the treatment plants cannot handle the full flow and a part of the untreated sewage gets into the streams and creates serious problems of water pollution. Therefore, we will have to find an effective method in dealing with and controlling this problem, and that is the purpose for the authorization of $20 million a year for demonstration grants in this particular field.

The bill also establishes a higher priority within the Department of Commerce for the agency dealing with this problem. Therefore, the Public Health Service has been raised in stature you might say to an agency called the Water Pollution Control Administration which will be under the jurisdiction of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce in order to give it the status required to deal with this increasingly important problem.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a good conference report. It represents an effective stride forward in meeting the needs of our Nation in controlling water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the great majority of the people of our Nation and all of the conservation groups of our Nation are most desirous that the Congress take positive action along these lines in order to deal effectively with this difficult problem.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California as well as the chairman of this committee and the other members of the conference committee for the magnificent job they have done in upholding the House position and in bringing back what in my judgment as a member of the Public Works Committee is one of the best bills we have ever had in this House of Representatives.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], as well as all of the members of the conference committee who brought forth this conference committee report.

It seems to me that the report resolves several difficult problems in a most appropriate and admirable way.

Mr. Speaker, my familiarity with this subject of control of water pollution results in large part from my service during the last session when I served on the so-called Jones committee, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] at which time we investigated the subject of water pollution throughout the entire Nation.

As a result of this experience I came to gain a great respect for the ability and record of progress demonstrated by some of the local and State agencies charged with this responsibility of water pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the conference committee report and the bill recognize the efficacy of these local and State agencies.

I cannot help but feel that responsibility for reducing and eliminating water pollution is one that will have to be undertaken in the long run by the local and State groups. This new legislation should not be interpreted as shifting responsibility to Washington. Instead, it should be noted that it affords direction and guidance on the part of the Federal Government and challenges the local and State agencies to do the job which they are charged with performing under the present legislation and which they are capable of performing.

We should not have any illusions about what we can do from Washington. We are going to have to recognize that water pollution problems are different wherever we find them, and each one differs from every other problem. While we provide funds, while we provide direction, while we provide a new administration for the purpose of resolving the problem of water pollution, at the same time the local and State governments must continue with their responsibility.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. I want to express my appreciation to all the conferees and to the able and respected chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for his support and for his competence and tolerance which enabled us to come out with a workable bill that I know has his support.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, all those who are deeply concerned at the extent to which pollution of our rivers and streams has denied our people the clean water so essential for our health and well-being must welcome the long-delayed appearance here today of the conference report on the Water Quality Act of 1965.

While I recognize that the compromise bill has given rise to some doubt about the speed and effectiveness with which the essential water quality standards can be agreed on and implemented, I share the conclusion of the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., that the legislation will bolster the antipollution cause and do much long-range good.

Final approval of this bill will place a heavy responsibility on State and Federal officials to get about the business of cleaning up the rivers and streams of the United States, so many of which—because of years of pollution—have become virtually unusable. The loss of this immense supply of water has contributed greatly to the present drought emergency in the Northeast. The recovery of the water—through enforcement of adequate water standards and more efficient administration of water pollution control statutes, which this bill will make possible—can help assure a successful attack on the long-range threat of drought.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Daily Journal editorial of September 17, 1965.

A WATER POLLUTION BILL AT LAST

A compromise nearly 5 months overdue has washed away the barriers to new Federal legislation for the control of water pollution. Its significance is heightened by the drought plight of the Northeast although, of course, the benefits will not come quickly.

The bill gives the States until July 1, 1967, to set water quality standards. It will take a long time to clean up streams and rivers rendered unusable in the present emergency by industrial contamination which has been pouring into them for years.

There's a handy example in the open sewer which is the Hudson River. Earlier this year, the harmful effects of industrial pollution were dramatized for New Jersey when 15,000 trout died in cyanide-tainted waters at the State hatchery in Hackettstown.

Regrettably, the bill had to be weakened by concessions in order to get it passed. The Senate measure, adopted January 28, empowered the Secretary of Health, Education,

and Welfare to set the water quality standards. Under the revision the States are given the opportunity first.

The change will please those who think the Federal Government is taking away too many of the States rights. But if the States would meet their obligations, there would be no reason for Washington to do what's obviously necessary.

Officials right now would not be casting about so anxiously for sources of potable water if greater attention had been paid by the States and their communities to the problem of pollution. In view of this laxity, more might have been accomplished faster by having the HEW Secretary fix the water standards.

Another provision in the compromise version could be used as a stalling tactic by industry. Companies will be allowed to appeal to the courts for exemptions from the standards.

Watered down as it is, though, the legislation will bolster the antipollution cause. It should do much long-range good.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—381

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—51

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Utah
Casey
Colmer
Diggs
Farnsley
Farnum
Fino
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, La.
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Powell
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Roybal
Sisk
Springer
Stephens
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Whitener
Morton
Murray
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Morton.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Farnum.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Farnsley.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Madden with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 11135.

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

There was no objection.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 588 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 588

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill

and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill, and read by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 588 makes in order the consideration of S. 2300 authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of Federal public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 3 hours of debate. It is an open rule. It waives points of order and it makes in order the substitute amendments recommended by the committee and as contained in the bill.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, it covers construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and flood control.

The last bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this subject was enacted in 1962. There is, on the average, an omnibus bill which has been brought up in the past every 2 to 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill covers 144 projects at an estimated cost of $1.97 billion in 41 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 588.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has explained the rule in accordance with my understanding and I concur in the remarks which he has made in that respect.

In addition thereto, Mr. Speaker, I would like to break the bill down briefly.

Mr. Speaker, title I is the "Northeastern U.S. Water Supply." This title would authorize an overall regional plan for meeting the future supply needs of the megalopolis now developing along the northeastern seaboard. The plan will provide for a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between river basins, and purification plants.

The title further provides that any works proposed must be specifically authorized by law. The usual procedure for formulation of such plans, include coordination with State, Federal, and interstate agencies which is a prerequisite to such enactment. The plan is to be a combination of Federal and non-Federal works.

Mr. Speaker, title II has to do with flood control projects.

This title seeks to expedite works on smaller water resources development projects. Presently, such projects are generally included in omnibus river and harbor bills and are subject to the same time consuming authorization procedures as are the major projects.

Mr. Speaker, this title's enactment will enable the committee to review such projects and approve them by resolution, action similar to that used by the Department of Agriculture under the Watershed Flood Prevention Act of 1944, and the GSA under the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

Mr. Speaker, projects under title II are found in the report on pages 13 to 146, inclusive. The title covers 88 projects, at a Federal cost estimated at about $1.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, title III is the beach erosion control projects program. A list of the projects contained under this title can be found at pages 151 through 235. There are 56 projects totaling some $348 million.

Mr. Speaker, section 310 of the bill is an interesting section in that it amends the existing authority available to the Corps of Engineers to construct small navigation and beach control projects without specific congressional authorization, by increasing the current Federal cost limitation to $500,000 per project. The total appropriation for one fiscal year is increased to $10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that all Members have received the same letter that I received from the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]. He objects to three items in this particular bill and I want to mention those as I am sure he will go into detail on them later during the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, one project has to do with the $227 million Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine.

The second project to which he objects and to which an amendment I understand will be offered to delete, has to do with the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir on the Cheat River in West Virginia.

The third project has to do with the Federal-private development of power in connection with two dams authorized by this bill to be built on the Flint River in Georgia.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt, as I suppose my colleagues are, of a letter from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who is in opposition to the first project mentioned under Mr. BALDWIN's letter, namely, the Dickey-Lincoln School project located on the St. John River in Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule itself.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. 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 (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2300, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are submitting today is S. 2300 or the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. Although it is identified as a Senate bill, it really is a new piece of legislation drawn up in the Public Works Committee.

The members of our committee have done an outstanding job in bringing this bill to the floor. I wish to publicly acknowledge the experienced skills of the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOB JONES], and the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHN BLATNIK].

After the Senate completed action on its bill, our committee was given many, many amendments to it. Because they were so numerous and complex and so many changes were made in the original version, we struck out all the language of the Senate bill and are now presenting the Public Works Committee bill as one big amendment. We did this with a view to clarity and saving of time.

S. 2300, as amended, is an omnibus bill similar in all aspects with similar legislation which has been passed regularly by many previous Congresses—in intervals of 2 to 4 years. The last major omnibus bill was in 1962.

However, I ask your indulgence of a few minutes to explain that this omnibus bill is by no means a matter of routine, or the usual and expected.

This year we were presented with one crisis after another—largely due to either too much water, or not enough water.

Weeks before this 89th Congress assembled, we were confronted with the unprecedented devastation caused by the Christmastime floods in the Northwestern States.

We were still studying the enormous destruction to this region's economy and its people when the upper Mississippi Basin areas were hit by floods in April and May.

The rampaging floods in the Mississippi had not abated, when he experienced another disaster in the San Antonio area in May. Then in June we were struck with even more floods in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska. Then, as

we are all aware, we have the critical drought conditions in the Eastern States from Maine to the Chesapeake Bay. We have water problems virtually in every area of the Nation.

To repeat, this omnibus bill is not the usual presentation. The challenge to the very future of our country rests in what we do with our natural resources, especially water, but the demands to do something about them extends to flood control, river development, water pollution, navigation and preservation of our open spaces and recreational areas, which are diminishing at too rapid a rate for our expanding population.

Willingness to meet these challenges are embodied in this legislation. There was willingness before, but now, it is of utmost urgency that we do more.

There are, frankly, many items in this report which were questioned by the committee. I insisted that this be done, before we acted favorably on them. This is one reason that the committee spent 5 weeks in consideration of the various proposals.

Also, there are other worthwhile proposals which are not included in this bill. These must have adequate hearings and consideration, and that explains their absence here. This is why we plan an annual omnibus bill in future years. There are, however, 144 projects in this omnibus bill, and I assure the House that every one of them was included only after long consideration and with full appreciation for their necessity in these critical times of natural upheavals, affecting our national life.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee this year has been extremely busy. The membership has been acutely aware of the needs of our country and its people, now and for future years. This omnibus bill is really a blueprint for long-delayed remedies on a national scale. In that light, we present it to the House, with the hope that it will agree.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished, able, and dedicated chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Flood Control, such time as he may desire.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, S. 2300, the rivers and harbors and flood control bill for 1965, is a result of diligent work on the part of all members of the Committee on Public Works.

I should like to add, in addition, that never in my 19 years of service on the committee have I seen such a cooperative spirit, such a display of talents, and such hard work. There was a spirit of cooperative thinking, work, and application for a total effort. No one could have worked better in harmony and more zealously than the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], the ranking minority member. We carefully analyzed and examined all the projects that were presented to the committee as well as the subject matter of the legislative proposals contained in the bill.

This bill includes 144 individual projects, and the total amount which would be authorized is $1,970,228,000. The projects are located in 41 States and cover flood control, navigation, water supply and related matters.

The Senate held extensive hearings on S. 2300 and passed a bill which was referred to the House Committee on Public Works. We held 5 weeks of hearings on various projects and related matters which were before the committee and eligible for consideration in a bill of this kind. The total amount involved in both the House and Senate version is substantially the same.

The bill has three separate titles. Title I is concerned with water supply for the Northeastern United States. Title II is flood control and related functions. Title III is navigation and beach erosion. In titles II and III, there, in addition to individual projects which are recommended for authorization, are a number of individual sections dealing with items of general or specific policy, and with provisions for authorizing the Corps of Engineers to carry on general investigations on new projects. In title II, flood control, there are 88 flood control and multiple-purpose projects, with a total authorization of $1,622,159,000.

In title III there are 47 navigation projects, and 9 beach erosion control propects, totaling $348 million. As I mentioned before, the total amount of authorization provided for in this bill is $1,970,228,000.

The committee in considering action on the bill decided that the numerous amendments that would be required to S. 2300 indicated the advisability of preparing a new bill and striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof a substitute which appears in the reported bill.

In addition to the individual projects which would be authorized in this bill, the committee has included two specific authorizations which it considers are needed and justified. The first is title I of the bill which gives authority for a comprehensive planning program, followed up by a construction program if authorized by the Congress, to attempt to solve the water supply problem of the Northeastern United States. The committee feels it would be folly for the Nation to disregard the warning which has been evident over the past several years. Many times in the past this country has recognized that with the growing complexity of social problems, it has become difficult for a solution to be achieved by individuals or local governmental units. The transition from the primitive water supply system of wells in local streams has long since been superseded by metropolitan water supplies. We have now reached the point where metropolitan water supplies are themselves no longer able to satisfy the needs of the people in large metropolitan areas without some degree of dependence upon consideration of water supply in adjoining basins.

Title I of the bill, therefore, would recognize this need and would provide for a plan and ultimate construction of reservoirs and distribution works for the northeastern United States, where the need for water supply is most severely felt. I would like to point out that the provisions of title I would also recognize the necessity for cooperating with the States and with the other Federal agencies in the formulation of such plans, and would specifically provide that the provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act—Public Law 89-80—would be completely recognized and would be actually complemented by the provisions of title I.

Mr. Chairman, the other major legislative item in the bill is the provision in section 201 that provides that projects may be approved by the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate if the total Federal cost does not exceed $10 million. This proviso is agreed to by all members of the committee and will tend to reduce the enormous burden which now is imposed upon the Congress by requiring individual consideration of a hash of small projects. This is exactly the same principle and the same proviso that was included in the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and in the Small Watershed Projects Act of the Soil Conservation Service. It streamlines the provisions of the present law for water resource projects in the same way that the program for public buildings and watershed were streamlined many years ago.

Water—the emerging water crisis in the northeastern portion of our country, the responsibility of the National Government and the development of practical means through cooperation at all levels of government for dealing with this grave problem—these are the themes of title I of S. 2300.

Its genesis is an imperative human need. At stake are the health, welfare, indeed, the very lives of the more than 30 million Americans now living in the vast metropolitan concentration along the Atlantic seaboard from New England to the Nation's Capital.

The Congress of the United States needs no demonstration of the importance of water to human welfare. We are, all of us, keenly aware of the pervasive necessity of water for the normal functions of life. But, only in comparatively recent years, with rising population and particularly the increasing concentration of our people within metropolitan areas, improving standards of living and the growing dependence of industrial technology upon enormous volumes of water, have most Americans begun to realize that water supplies from customary sources are not inexhaustible.

Congress, of course, has long recognized the water problems of the arid portions of our country and for many years has approved and supported Federal action to provide the great irrigation and reclamation works upon which the very existence of modern civilization in the Western States depends. Indeed, the Hoover Dam on the Colorado River constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation is a vital element in the growth of southern California, where the city of Los Angeles and many other communities with a population of some 5 million people are dependent to a major degree upon the Colorado River aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California which conveys water from the Colorado Basin to the Pacific coast.

A measure of Federal responsibility for water supply generally was accepted

in the Water Supply Act of 1958 with respect to the incorporation of water supply storage in Federal multipurpose reservoirs.

Again in 1961, the Congress, by amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act, authorized inclusion in Federal reservoirs of storage for regulation of streamflow for water quality control as a Federal responsibility.

And in this very session of Congress, the Water Resources Planning Act was enacted with a policy statement to the effect that:

In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

This developing congressional recognition of the national interest in water supply problems is well founded.

In the highly competent and comprehensive report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission published in 1950, it is stated:

There is a pressing need for improved cooperation in the planning of river and drainage basin studies which necessarily involve municipal water supplies. * * * The continuing expansion of urban population and industry will require expanding volumes of water. Planning for the development of river systems and drainage basins for the best multipurpose use should, in the broad national interest, take into consideration all problems of industrial and domestic water supply which directly involve the great majority of the people of the Nation.

Former President Eisenhower commented on the emerging water crisis in these words:

If we are to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil or can be extracted from the oceans.

The late President Kennedy, concerned with the pressure of new demands for water, in a message to Congress stated that:

Our goal, therefore, is to have sufficient water, sufficiently clean, in the right place at the right time to serve the range of human and industrial needs.

President Lyndon B. Johnson—then Vice President—in his dedication of the late, great Senator Robert S. Kerr's book entitled "Land, Wood, and Water," said:

To the Nation collectively, the growing water crisis is just as urgent as it was to me personally when my family was stranded and my property menaced. In fact, I am of the opinion that water management is a decisive tool in our mighty struggle for national security and world peace. The best control and use of this precious resource is the key to progress here and elsewhere.

A keen sense of the urgency of the problem is reflected in the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources under the chairmanship of Senator Kerr. There the committee stated:

Human existence depends on water. The pervasiveness of water is revealed dramatically, yet simply, in the initial verses of Genesis' stirring account of the creation. Science tells us that the earliest forms of life began in the vast oceans of the primeval earth. We know that the human body is over 70 percent water. Without water, life as we know it would perish from the earth.

This precious mineral has been a key to man's advancement since before the beginning of recorded history. In addition to personal uses, we need it to grow our crops, to water our stock, to move our heavy cargoes, to dispose of our wastes. Many manufacturing processes depend on water. It is the universal solvent, the universal coolant. We use it to power our industry. And when our work is done, we find water is essential to much of our recreational activity.

The earliest civilizations were established where water supplies were available. Recorded history began in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, and the Nile. Many historians believe that the decline and disappearance from the face of the earth of ancient civilizations in many of the arid or semiarid regions began with the failure to properly use their available water resources. And today, water is assuming ever-increasing importance, as civilization's needs for water and water related products and services grow. Areas of this globe that will thrive, or even survive, will be determined by the availability of water resources and their wise use to serve man.

With its abundant supply of good water, and its advanced technology and skills, the United States need never suffer for lack of water. Water shortages can be alleviated. The lack of water need not limit our economic destiny. But positive action must be substituted for complacency. There is work to be done, work to develop and use the abundant resources placed in our custody by a munificent providence, work to develop the practices and techniques which will permit ever-increasing needs to be filled within the finite limits of the resources we have.

And it was Senator Kerr, with the foresight of deep knowledge, who pinpointed the grave problem with which we seek to deal in title I of the pending bill. In his brilliant book, "Land, Wood and Water," he underscored the growing danger to our national welfare in these words:

Some 40 million Americans today are teetering on the edge of a serious water shortage. * * * This is true all the way from Long Beach, Calif., to Baltimore, Md. New Yorkers were urged to limit drastically their use of water in a recent dry year, before works to bring in their new supply from the Delaware River could be completed.

This is an emergency looking in our windows. Our growing civilization can be rudely jolted, if not checked, by lack of water in the taps. It can be as threatening to survival as the missiles which tower on the launching pads. We can learn from the lessons of Oklahoma City and Washington and New York and wherever shortages have imperiled the lives of our cities. We can bequeath our children cities of iron and stone and aluminum, but we had better be sure we give them the water to make them livable.

This wisdom has guided your committee in its search for a fruitful approach to what may well be the most critical domestic problem of our time.

We have sought a plan of action which can be initiated now, for there is no time to lose. It is later than most of us can yet imagine until the specter of drought directly touches our own lives. The Corps of Engineers is a force in being with the know-how, the skills and the experience to proceed at once to develop a plan of action. In countless disasters we have called upon the corps. It has never been found wanting in dedication and competence. It will not fail us now.

We have sought a program also which will bring to bear the wisdom and concern of all affected groups, agencies of government—National, State, and local, as well as private interests. Under the proposed legislation, as explained in the committee's report there will be no conflict with existing law and policy in the matter of river basin planning under the Water Resources Planning Act, for the committee seeks coordination of plans developed under that act in the light of the transcendent problem of the entire northeastern region. Nor will there be any impairment of the existing interstate compacts or other governmental or private interests. For, applicable statutes and directives will assure consultation and cooperation, prior to authorization of recommended works in accordance with law.

Finally, the committee has sought an approach sufficiently comprehensive to deal fully with all ramifications and aspects of the problem. National initiative and a framework for requisite national action are imperative. Just as in the case of flood control, the problem transcends local and State authority and range. Water supplies for the rising concentrations of populations along the eastern seaboard are alread dependent upon multi-State sources. A unified system of supply must eventually be found for the entire complex of related urban and suburban communities. The Federal responsibility cannot be ignored without endangering the health and welfare of millions.

We, therefore, offer the Congress, not a solution, for that is the goal we seek, but an approach with the potential for a solution, comprehensive in scope, sensitive to the variety and complexity of the interests involved and capable of activation soon enough to forestall a national disaster. If we fail to act now—wisely and effectively—we shall be answerable for the suffering of millions of our fellow citizens and for a major impairment to the future welfare of our country. We must not fail.

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

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

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I might say that it was a privilege until this year to serve with the gentleman who is now in the well, on the great Committee on Public Works in the House of Representatives. I miss my work on that committee and I have missed working with the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I should like to say that during the gentleman's tenure on the committee he was the most effective and attentive member that we had. We have a pleasant memory of his service on the committee.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. I should like to congratulate him and also my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], on the interest and concern that they have both shown

in the problems of the Northeast with respect to water.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the gentleman that the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], who is coauthor of title I, and I do not live in the areas affected, but we did recognize that a national problem there did exist, and therefore we should address ourselves to it promptly. That is what we have earnestly sought to accomplish.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, like most of my colleagues from New York, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, under date of September 14 this year I received from the Delaware River Basin Commission a copy of a resolution stating that title I, to which the gentleman has been addressing himself, would, in the words of the resolution:

> Cause a major redistribution of governmental responsibilities within the Federal Government and as between the Federal Government and the States, regional agencies, and local governments.

Will the gentleman comment on that particular point?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will turn to page 11 of the report, commenting on title I of the bill he will find the language specifically setting forth that we were not to trespass upon the authority or the sovereignty or the capabilities of the Delaware Commission. We stated specifically that we were giving them another tool, because they are the ones to implement this program in the area. We thought we were enhancing their role in water resource development, not diminishing it.

Mr. ROBISON. The gentleman refers to page 11, in which it is stated:

> The committee wishes to emphasize that the legislation envisioned in title I will result in no impairment of existing interstate compacts, such as the Delaware River compact, the New England compact, and others.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that section 203 of the bill requires the same reporting system that is contained in the Flood Control Act, section 8, of 1944, so the Corps of Engineers could not transmit to the Congress a report involving the territory or jurisdiction of the Delaware Commission without its comment, as is presently done under existing law.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield one moment further, is not the point here perhaps that the Delaware River Basin Commission has misunderstood this legislation?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would presume so.

Mr. BALDWIN. Precisely this—that there would be no change under title I of the existing congressional procedures requiring first authorization of any project that might be fitted into such plan as the gentleman envisions; and, second, an appropriation by the Congress of the necessary funds to go forward with that project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We have the same authorization scheme that we have used historically and are doing again with the provisions of titles I and II of the bill.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, where it is stated in title I, section 10, that the plan shall provide for the construction, operation, and so forth of these projected facilities, that language means, in effect, shall only be done according to the carrying out of the traditional congressional procedures for any such facilities or project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would direct the gentleman's attention to the language which appears on page 46 of the bill. Does the gentleman from Alabama have a copy before him?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, I do not have a copy at the moment. If the gentleman will withhold his questions, there are 144 projects involved, and I do not have them all in front of me. Let me discuss the matter with the gentleman and I shall go into it further with him later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would suit me better. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe this bill is a demonstration of the effective, and I believe extremely effective, action that can result from our committee seeking and getting a consensus on most of the matters pending before us, particularly when we are given the liberty to do so.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion we were not permitted to work our will in relation to the bill which we voted out of the committee today, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 bill.

Mr. Chairman, we were given an opportunity to consider this rivers and harbors and flood control matter on its merits. I believe this bill is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, the points of differences of opinion are pointed out largely or clarified largely in the supplemental views of the minority Members.

Those views indicate a difference of opinion relating specifically to certain projects in the flood control section of the bill, and I refer principally to certain projects involving a basic issue which we traditionally have on this bill. This is the question of public power versus private power in those instances when it appears to the committee or at least the members of the committee who are in favor of not using public funds for public power development that private enterprise can do the job and can do it reasonably and can provide power at a more reasonable cost and thus not burden the Federal taxpayers with that additional cost of public power, than can public power at taxpayers expense.

That question, Mr. Chairman, is involved in the projects which will be discussed in detail by the ranking minority member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], and involved with projects that are discussed in the supplemental views in the House report itself on S. 2300 and which involve the Dickey-Lincoln project, on the Saint John River in Maine, the Rowlesberg Dam and Reservoir on the Cheat River in West Virginia, and the Flint River Basin in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, those are the principal matters in controversy, and I assume that they will be discussed in the debate and also at the time for amendments. I understand amendments will be offered in an effort to bring those projects basically into consistency with the Bureau of the Budget recommendations in some instances and with our views relating to private power versus public power in other instances. The gentleman from California will discuss them in greater detail.

Let me say, given an opportunity to work our will with a free hand, the committee has come up with a bill that, except for those three projects, deserves the support of the Members of the House. As a matter of fact, I think it is one of the most significant authorization bills relating to basic law concerning public works, rivers and harbors, and flood control, that has been brought before this House in my memory. This is for a number of reasons. The reason the gentleman from Alabama just mentioned, relating to title I, is one reason. The Northeastern United States water supply provision provides for a plan to be developed by the Corps of Engineers relating to making available in the future, pursuant to this plan, an adequate water supply and adequate reservoirs. I must say it offers new areas of possibility, and I say possible Federal participation, and that is the transmission lines and purification programs envisioned in the plan.

Again, I specifically point out a proposition that this is a plan and study. I understand the gentleman from Alabama is considering some amendments, one of which would have the effect of clarifying the point asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON]. It is a question I raised in the committee. I offered an amendment, as a matter of fact, that would have required consultation with State authorities, including the local authorities and private enterprise, relating to water resources studies, planning, and programing.

The gentleman from Alabama stated that this was the intention and, therefore, it would be written into the report that that is the case, and it so appears in the language the gentleman read on page 11 of the report, and I quote:

> The usual procedure for formulation of such plans including coordination with State, Federal, and interstate agencies is a prerequisite to such enactment. The same procedures as contained in the present laws shall be applicable to such projects. It should be emphasized that the plan would be a combination of Federal and non-Federal works taking into account those features which may best be constructed or operated and maintained by non-Federal interests.

The gentleman confirms that is a correct statement of his position, particu-

larly in view of his comment on section 203 which sets up the procedures.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do agree with the gentleman because the report, as the gentleman has pointed out, states that specifically.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is also considering offering an amendment that will carry out what is stated in the committee report, and that is to the effect that these plans shall be in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act and consistent therewith. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. At the appropriate time I will offer this amendment:

On page 37, strike out the sentence which begins on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (P.L. 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States."

Mr. CRAMER. That act specifically provides for the question raised by the gentleman from New York, a question I also raised requiring State, local, and private enterprise interests involved in this function of providing water resources. I am the first to admit that has become one of the most serious problems in America and, in particular, in the Northeast. That act specifically says in section 2:

In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprise, and others concerned.

Now the gentleman is incorporating by reference that language into this legislation; is he not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the sole intention of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. So there should be no question about State, local, and private enterprise participation not only with the Water Resources Planning Council but also the Corps of Engineers consideration of recommendations of the Planning Council. Is it my understanding also under the act as it presently exists, the Water Resources Planning Act, that under that the Planning Council does not have the authority to actually come up with plans itself relating to water resources development and therefore this title is needed in order to give the Corps of Engineers proper authority and the power to so evolve a plan?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is my understanding of the act which the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, whatever plan is being considered has to first be submitted to the Congress for proper authorization at the time the plan is promulgated and proposed. Then, second, for a proper appropriation of funds following congressional action relating to the authorization. So we do get another look, not once but twice, at whatever plan is proposed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I compliment the gentleman from Florida for the statement he has made, and in particular, on his colloquy with the chairman because, as the chairman knows, he and I toured the country this last year together. While we are now referring to a matter that affects the Northeast, the same thing can be said for the Northwest part of the United States and the areas that we toured out in California, Oregon, and Washington. I think we are setting the stage properly here today with this language which is to be included as mentioned by the chairman. We are in the stages of developing a similar plan for development in my congressional district of California. The Corps of Engineers has developed a preliminary plan of development and presented it to the committee early in the year. Further recommendations will be brought to the committee and the Congress in the coming years as we work cooperatively with the State of California for the maximum development of our water resources.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Recently the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Holum, came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works and asked for funds to be included in the pending supplemental bill which will reach us here eventually for the staffing of the water resources council, so called. I asked him at that time if he had any position that he could give to us and particularly to me with respect to title I as contained in the bill before us. He said he did not. I asked him whether or not he envisioned or the Interior Department, since the chairman of that department is chairman of the water resources council—if the Secretary envisioned that the water resources council would be a studying agency with authority to make plans of this type by itself. The answer was—no, it was a coordinating body only. And this is, I think, what the gentleman is attempting to bring out.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I am glad that the record was clarified before his subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee as well, and that the agency is apparently going to follow the intention of the Congress relating to that.

Mr. ROBISON. To continue further, if there were to be studies of this sort, they should and would be done by the various existing agencies or departments having competence in this field so I assume that in this instance it would be the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CRAMER. I trust that this helps to clarify the question of title I relating to the Northeast water study.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important authorization bills that we have considered in some time, not because of the dollar value of approximately $2 billion and, incidentally, that is about what the previous authorization bill was and it has been 3 years since we considered one and this is in effect resulting from a 3-year backlog of projects, and usually we only consider 2-year backlogs so the $2 billion figure is not, in my opinion, an unreasonable one in that respect.

Now what else did the committee do which was of considerable consequence? One thing it did was to promote a new procedure which the gentleman from Alabama explained relating to the authorization of projects, the cost of which does not exceed $10 million. That is the estimated Federal first-cost share does not exceed $10 million. That is the procedure similarly consistent with the Public Buildings Authorization Act of 1959.

That act permits authorization by committees, committees of the House and Senate, instead of authorization by the House and the Senate, or the Congress of public buildings.

The purpose of that provisions is obviously to expedite consideration of these projects. I believe there is every justifications for expedition, for the simple reason that the cost of these projects and the estimated benefits of these projects, as well, often change considerably between the date that they are studied and the date that they are up before our committee for authorization and actual congressional authorization. In many instances that lag time is most unreasonable. The purpose of the provision is to get these projects before them when the figures we have are reliable and obviously when the projects are needed.

Therefore, because of that principle, and knowing the problems that have been involved, in particular relation to this bill, it having been 3 years before we had an omnibus bill, I support the concept of $10 million—no more than that—for estimated Federal share on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion projects, to be subject to committee authorization.

However, it is my personal view that possibly the rivers and harbors, and beach erosion projects should be a lesser amount, because that involves about 85 percent of the projects in this bill, as an example.

However, we have crossed that bridge. The $10 million figure offers one problem. I should like to discuss it briefly. I may have an amendment relating to it. The figure involved in the $10 million top figure relates to the "estimated Federal share." Many times when we get to the appropriation stage, the amount estimated by the Corps of Engineers increases substantially. If there is one thing I want to be sure is avoided by this $10 million authorization section, so far as this Member is concerned, it is to see that this is not used as a subterfuge and not made a sham out of by the proponents

of the projects, or the Corps of Engineers, or the Bureau of the Budget, using the $10 million figure, their objective being to keep under it even though they know full well that that figure would not be substantiated at a later appropriation date, when a new estimate would have to be justified.

It should be perfectly clear in the record that the $10 million figure which is authorized is an estimated Federal share, and that can be increased substantially at the time of the appropriation without additional authorization by our committee.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is not a correct statement. The amount authorized in this bill, and all others, is the "estimated Federal share" of the cost of the projects as it relates to the $10 million committee authorization section in the bill; is that not correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it not correct that at the time of the appropriation the figure can be exceeded without our committee acting further on the authorization?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It may not exceed the $10 million authorization.

Mr. CRAMER. I am quoting the language in section 201, a committee authorization similar to that for public buildings, which section is for projects estimated to cost not more than $10 million, which reads as follows: "if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10 million"—that is the estimated Federal first cost. Before the Appropriations Committee, that figure could be exceeded if the estimate at that time should exceed the estimate before our committee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; the appropriation could not exceed $10 million. For example, if the Appropriations Committee were considering a project, the authorization for which might be $5 million, that committee could not make an expenditure of $6 million. The same rule applies here.

Mr. CRAMER. I will ask the gentleman an additional question, using the example of the Housatonic River Basin on page 41 of the bill. There is proposed the authorizing of the project "at an estimated cost of $5,100,000."

If the estimate of the cost of that project at the time of appropriation is $6 million, in the opinion of the gentleman would the Appropriations Committee exceed its authority, if it authorized the expenditure of funds in excess of $5.1 million?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe it would.

Mr. CRAMER. I hope that is true, but I understand that is not the procedure followed, and that in many instances the Appropriations Committee exceeds the amount and does so because the language is "the estimated cost."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the estimated cost is submitted to the Public Works Committee at $5.1 million and is so approved, no appropriation should be made in excess of that amount.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it the intention of the gentleman—because it is the intention of this gentleman, as well—that the $10 million top figure shall be the limitation not only for authorization before our committee but also for appropriations before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is stating correctly what section 201 intends to accomplish. There can not be an appropriation in excess of the authorized amount.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

I would hope, with this legislative record, that the top limitation will be observed. I should be very concerned if by authorizing an estimated amount appropriations could be provided for a project substantially in excess of that amount. I hope this legislative record will clarify that.

There is one other point relating to new authorizations generally under this bill which I want to discuss. It takes another giant step—and I believe a giant step forward—by providing that the small project authorization amounts and the lump sum appropriations shall be increased. The total appropriation is to be increased to some $10 million for all of these small projects, and the size of the projects is to be increased from $200,000 per project, for Federal costs, for rivers and harbors, to $500,000, and from $400,000 for beach erosion to $500,000. That brings those into uniformity. Flood control remains at the present amount of $1 million which does not require authorization by Congress and under this new procedure authorization by the committees, or even the submission to Congress of a resolution authorizing a survey of the project.

These are the small projects on which the Corps of Engineers can act to authorize them. The Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee will have submissions made to them regarding the project, but our committee does not need to take action thereon.

I believe that is a sound approach. The proposal in the subcommittee was to make it $1 million for all such projects. The full committee, I believe properly so, made it half a million dollars for beach erosion and rivers and harbors, and $1 million for flood control, as it presently is. I support that action.

There were two other matters on which the committee took action. I wish to call those briefly to the attention of the House.

First, this bill authorizes a codification of all water resources laws, which will permit those who are interested, the general public and the local authorities, to know exactly what is the basic law relating to all of these projects now and in the future, as was done with respect to the highway recodification. I believe that is a sound approach, and I am confident the Engineers will carry it out in the very near future.

There is another section which was written into the bill, which contains language I shall comment on, relating to those communities which wish to go forward with a project and be reimbursed for the expenditure when the construction is consistent with whatever plan has been authorized by Congress. Many such examples have been called to our attention. As a matter of fact, there are some in this bill where we specifically as a committee—and hopefully, the Congress—authorize repayment to those local communities when the work done is consistent with the plans authorized by the Congress.

It is my belief that we should not pick and choose in these projects, we should not say "yes; it is all right" to one and not to another, without having some sort of standard apply to all of them. For that reason, I proposed, and there is now in this bill, a provision that a restudy be made relating to what our policy should be concerning reimbursement of moneys expended by the local interests on projects when the work done is consistent with the authorized project, permitting possible Federal repayment to that community or local agency sometime in the future.

I hope it will result in some standard or nationwide policy relating to this matter, which can be considered at the proper time in the next authorization bill. I think this is a good and sound approach to this problem which to date we are dealing with on a project-by-project, piecemeal basis, with no real standards being involved.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I request this time so as to address some questions to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland, with regard to a project in Georgia known as Trotter's Shoals. In years past it has not been authorized by the committee on the grounds that it did not have approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I want to ask the chairman at this point if it is true that this project is now before his committee as pending business. Is that true, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FALLON. May I say to the gentleman that no consideration was given to Trotter's Shoals as a project this year because at the time we were considering the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill we did not have the proper reports on Trotter's Shoals, but I understand that we do have the reports and it will be pending business before the Committee on Public Works when an omnibus bill is considered next year.

Mr. LANDRUM. Is it the intention of the chairman that his committee will meet next year, in 1966, to consider an omnibus rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. FALLON. That is the desire of the committee at the present time.

Mr. LANDRUM. And at that time the Trotter's Shoals project will be pending business before the committee?

Mr. FALLON. It is pending business and will be given consideration.

Mr. LANDRUM. The record discloses that the project labeled as Trotter's Shoals now has the approval of the De-

partments of Commerce, Defense, HEW, Agriculture, Interior as well as the Bureau of the Budget. Is that correct?

Mr. FALLON. As I understand it, that is correct.

Mr. LANDRUM. So there will be no necessity when the committee reconvenes January next to again ask these departments to make reports?

Mr. FALLON. No, it will not be necessary to get a second report. It will be pending business.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300. During the 5 weeks of intensive hearings that our Subcommittee on Flood Control held on the flood control aspects of the bill, it has been my privilege to work very closely with the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. No person in this House worked with more diligence, more conscientiousness, and more sincerity on this flood control section of the bill than did the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. It was a privilege on my part to work with him on this bill.

This bill is a many-faceted bill. It affects practically every part of the country. In the northern California region the bill contains authorization for a very important deep water channel project from San Francisco Bay to Stockton. This is a project which has been made necessary by the trend toward deeper draft shipping which has occurred since World War II. This trend has had an impact on deep water ports throughout the Nation.

Since World War II, particularly with tankers and bulk cargo carriers, there have been bigger and bigger ships built with deeper draft, and the old channel depths that at one time could accommodate all types of ships no longer can accommodate the new type vessels. For this reason it is important to the northern California region that there is included in this bill the project authorizing a deep water channel from San Francisco Bay to Stockton to handle the deeper draft ships now coming into San Francisco Bay and serving the ports on the tributaries to that bay.

Also, in this bill is another survey important to that area; that is the authorization of a study by the Corps of Engineers of the feasibility of constructing an interceptor drain to go around San Francsico Bay and out to the ocean to handle the disposal of sewage effluent and industrial wastes, including agricultural waste waters so that these might be disposed of in the ocean and not involve further pollution to San Francisco Bay. This is a study to determine whether construction of such an interceptor drain might be feasible. The recommendations of the Corps of Engineers will have to come back to Congress and be considered by this body.

There are in this bill several projects involving public power on a major scale, and on these projects there was a sincere difference of opinion within our committee. And there has been for many years a sincere difference of opinion among the Members of the House as a whole on this issue. In most cases, the House has given recognition to the fact that in connection with multiple-purpose projects it may be necessary to authorize public power as a part of those projects. But where projects are of such a nature that the power aspects can be differentiated from the rest of the project there have been differences of opinion as to how these should be handled.

In this bill this issue has come to a focal point in three projects; the St. John's project in Maine, the Cheat River project involving Rowlesburg Dam in West Virginia and the Flint River project in Georgia.

The St. John's project in Maine basically is a single-purpose project for all practical purposes because it involves more than 95 percent power, and therefore it is basically a power project. The flood control aspects in it are minute.

In connection with the Rowlesburg Dam on the Cheat River in West Virginia and also the Flint River project, these are multiple-purpose projects that could be justified from an economic standpoint without the public power features being constructed by the Federal Government. In each of these three cases there was testimony before the committee by representatives of private enterprise, in the form of the investor-owned public utility companies in the areas involved that they had been providing the power needs of the area and felt that they could continue to do so in the future.

Those of us who are concerned about the size of the Federal budget today, those of us who are concerned about the size of the Federal deficit today do not feel that Federal funds should be expended where testimony has been given before our committee that the power needs of an area can adequately be supplied by private enterprise in the form of investor-owned public utility companies. For this reason there will be amendments offered on the floor to eliminate the St. John's project and to modify the Cheat River project in West Virginia and the Flint River project in Georgia. In the case of the Cheat River project, the amendment will authorize the project except for the public power aspects of the project; and in the case of the Flint River project the amendment will authorize a partnership development of the project so that private enterprise can develop the power facilities in connection with the project.

I might say in connection with the Cheat River project in West Virginia that an application has been pending before the Federal Power Commission on the part of an investor-owned public utility for a permit to build a power facility on that river. Just a few weeks ago—since our hearings in fact—the Federal Power Commission has granted a preliminary permit to that private company to make a study to determine the feasibility of going forward with such power facilities on their own.

I do not believe we should be authorizing a public power project in connection with that dam when this private application is pending and a study has been authorized by the Federal Power Commission to determine the feasibility of constructing private power facilities to provide the power needs of that area.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments will be offered during the amendment period. We hope the House will consider these amendments on their merits, giving consideration to the need for our saving the expenditure of Federal funds wherever such savings are possible.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] about a bill which I introduced, H.R. 8298, and which I had hoped would become a part of this omnibus bill.

Mr. Chairman, that bill would have authorized the Secretary of the Department of the Army to grant rights of storage and transportation on the Dworshak Reservoir in Idaho.

My question is with reference to the disposition of the committee toward the bill and whether it was judged necessary for the activities planned on that reservoir.

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

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentlemen from Idaho that the Flood Control Subcommittee examined the proposition which the gentleman has reference to, most thoroughly.

As the gentleman knows, the Department of the Army reported that it now is in possession of sufficient statutory authority to do under existing law what the gentleman from Idaho proposes to do in his resolution.

If the gentleman will refer to the 1962 Flood Control Act, sections 2667 and 2668 of title 10, United States Code, the gentleman will find that this confers ample power upon the Secretary to do everything he could do under H.R. 8298, if it were adopted.

There was no necessity for the committee to report out that bill, since there is ample statutory authority to accomplish the aims of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama and to congratulate him on the bill which he has brought before the Congress today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the project to provide flood protection on Chartiers Creek Basin in Pennsylvania, which is to be found at page 57 of the bill, and which is located in the Ohio River Basin, and to be found at page 37 of the report.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor today to urge immediate authorization of the Chartiers Valley flood control program.

The House Public Works Committee is to be congratulated on approving this vitally necessary program when reporting to the House favorably S. 2300, the rivers and harbors and flood control bill.

On April 21, 1965, I appeared before the Senate Public Works Committee strongly urging that the committee act favorably on the authorization of the Chartiers Valley flood control program in Allegheny County, Pa. This is a necessary and urgent program, and should be considered on an emergency basis, not only because of the families, homes, and businesses endangered, but because this valley contains many U.S. defense industries. The various Federal agencies as well as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have all approved this project and recommended its completion.

The Chartiers Valley flood control project has now been favorably recommended by the U.S. Army Engineers for the western district of Pennsylvania, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington, D.C., the Chief of Engineers of the Department of Army, and the Secretary of the Army. The U.S. Bureau of the Budget approved this project on April 10, 1964.

The Chartiers Valley area in Allegheny and Washington Counties contains 276.67 square miles, has 217,592 population in Allegheny County, and 98,984 population in Washington County. The total number of employees of Chartiers Valley industries is about 6,500 in the Carnegie-Bridgeville region, Allegheny County, and about 4,000 employees in the Canonsburg-Houston region, Washington County. It is apparent that the Chartiers Valley area is an important part of the economy of western Pennsylvania, and that these recurring annual floods in this valley have caused great damage and loss to many people in this large geographical area.

As Congressman for the 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, representing the Chartiers Valley area in Allegheny County, I have been working closely with my good friend and colleague, Congressman TOM MORGAN, of Washington County, as well as with our two U.S. Senators for the State of Pennsylvania, Senator JOSEPH CLARK and Senator HUGH SCOTT, to see that the Chartiers Valley flood control program is immediately undertaken to eliminate further unnecessary disasters and hardship in this economically depressed area. All citizens in the area, business and labor alike, are united in appealing for immediate action on this long overdue flood control program.

I strongly urge the immediate authorization of the Chartiers Valley flood control program on an emergency basis to prevent damage to vital national industries in the Chartiers Valley at this time of stress and strain in Vietnam.

We must also remember that the homes, the jobs, the workers, and their families in the Chartiers Valley are in danger every year as there have been almost annual damaging floods in the Chariers Valley over 50 years now. In 1956 the area was declared a national disaster emergency area when Chartiers Creek once more flooded its banks and the valley it traces. And as recently as 1963 the residents of Chartiers Valley were again subjected to a disastrous flood.

Immediate authorization is essential to safeguard the lines, the businesses, the homes, and families of the Chartiers Valley and to protect the vital defense industry located there.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say on the bill presently being considered will relate entirely to only one project—the Dickey-Lincoln School project in northern Maine. I do not intend to engage in a philosophical discussion concerning private versus public power; rather, I want only to talk some economic sense. That there are serious questions concerning the economic feasibility of this project is clearly indicated by the fact that these questions concerning it are coming from both sides of the aisle—so what we have to discuss is bipartisan in nature.

The Dickey-Lincoln School authorization will, in due course of time, amount to something well in excess of $300 million. The present authorization is for $227 million—which, by the way, constitutes almost 10 percent of the entire bill. However, if it is authorized, and in time built with an additional $80 million for transmission lines, the total cost will be about $300 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, $300 million is a considerable sum of money for the Members to consider. If the proposed project had clear benefits to the Nation; if the Federal agencies involved were in agreement; if it were going to pay itself off in due course of time; and if it benefited the New England area without damaging other parts of the Nation, then we might be able to proceed with confidence. But it does none of these things—and it seems to me that a bill with five strikes against it has to be considered a bad bill—any way you look at it.

Let us take up these five points briefly, examine them carefully, and then see if our colleagues can still, in good conscience, approve such a massive authorization.

First, the question must be raised as to whether there would be a clear benefit to the Nation. I think to be fair one must agree the expenditure of well over 200 million Federal dollars in Maine would bring benefits to that State. Even if only temporary—and it would be temporary—a depressed region would be helped. The question then immediately comes to mind as to whether there might not be a better way to assist this State, and it would appear—once looking at this project—there must be a number of ways which are better. On the other hand, extensive testimony during our committee's hearings indicated that in order for this project to succeed—to be economically feasible—it had to be considered on a New England-wide basis.

There is also considerable evidence that although the theoretical purpose of the project is to help reduce the high power costs of this region, it will not even do that. Therefore, if this power project is a temporary pumping of Federal dollars into the Maine economic bloodstream and there are better ways to accomplish such a goal, then I submit it cannot be classified as a project having national benefits. I have every desire to assist the people of Maine with their economic problems; I am simply saying we should, and can, do that within the context of national benefit.

The second important question which must be discussed if we are to bring any sort of reason to this proposal relates to the disagreement of Federal agencies over the desirability of proceeding at this time with the Dickey-Lincoln School portion of the Passamaquoddy project. A careful reading of the report of the Secretary of the Interior to the President, dated July 9 of this year, indicated basic disagreements between several agencies concerning the project. For this reason, I suggested in my supplemental views to the Public Works Committee report on S. 2300 that the interested Federal agencies have not given the Congress sufficient information upon which to make an enlightened decision. The Interior Department gives us a set of numbers concerning costs on the project. But these numbers are directly challenged by the electric companies of the area who should be in a pretty good position to know the cost situation in their own area. In addition, two comprehensive engineering studies, done by consulting engineering firms, challenged the cost figures of Interior. The Commerce Department, in their report, expressed reservations concerning the project. The Treasury Department questioned the interest rates used in charting the costs of the job.

Now, in the midst of all of this confusion, we are being asked to proceed with an authorization of immense size without further information. The electric companies of the area, rather than simply opposing this project have offered concrete, well-thought-out, and feasible economic alternatives that would not require the expenditure of a dime of the public's money. Therefore, I submit that this hardly qualifies as a project with which we can proceed with confidence.

Meeting the standards of feasibility previously established by the Congress brings us into still another gray area. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all know it is a requirement that other alternatives be carefully examined before requests for authorization are made. Yet here we find, from the testimony at the hearings, that the Interior Department quickly skimmed over available alternatives—that is, the generation of electric power by large thermal plants—both conventional and nuclear, tied to pumped-storage electric plants. Several Federal agencies questioned the lack of sufficient exploration of these alternatives, and I question them as well. Additionally, it was admitted by the Secretary of the Interior at the hearings that no studies, or even conversations, had been held with the private com-

panies of this area concerning the marketing of the power to be produced. And yet more than 90 percent of this power will have to be sold to these companies for the project even to come close to being feasible. The electric companies have indicated serious reservations about the ultimate purchase of the output of this project, because they say the power will cost too much; will, in fact, cost more than they are producing power for at some of their plants right now, and most certainly will cost more than the average to be produced in New England by 1972 when this project would go on the line. No consideration of nuclear-conventional thermal plants tied to pumped storage, no consideration of marketing plans; this hardly meets the standards of the Congress, requiring thorough examination of feasible alternatives.

Perhaps an even more fundamental issue, Mr. Chairman, is whether the Congress is being asked here for a subsidy rather than an investment that will pay off over a period of years. In an unusual move, the Interior Department is taking a 100-year period of amortization and benefit, when, by their own previous standards, 50 years is used. Why does this project have a 100-year life? I still do not have the answer to that question. If anything, it should probably have a 25-year life in view of the fact that, in the New England area, anyway, the rapid development of nuclear power and large-scale conventional thermal efficiencies are making waterpower peaking stations increasingly obsolete. Some engineers question whether any such plant can now be considered modern and efficient when measured against the fact that the small Yankee atomic electric plant in this area, built at a cost of only $40 million, is turning out power—and more of it—than this massive project will be able to do a half decade or more from now. How can we be reasonably expected to believe that Dickey-Lincoln School will be an efficient, low-cost power source in the year 2070? A questionable payoff in economic terms indeed.

Finally, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that even considering all the foregoing, if the project benefited all the New England States—which it does not or it hardly seems likely there would be Members of the House from that area opposing it—you could make some kind of a case for it, provided it did no harm to other areas of the Nation. But it does. It would mean, for example, that this large hydroelectric plant would be built—slowing down the development of the nuclear industry in the New England region, reducing the sale of coal and oil to the region and benefiting no one at all since it would not reduce the cost of power to the consumers of the region.

Mr. Chairman, frankly I get a little lost in the maze of some kind of new political-economic logic that asks us earlier in the session to appropriate moneys to assist economically deprived Appalachia and its coal industry—and then later in the session asks us to authorize even more Federal moneys so that we can reduce this business more in Appalachia by building a project which will do nothing for the people of New England.

It seems to me to be like something out of "Alice in Wonderland." And it reminds me of the saying therein, "Will you walk a little faster, said the whiting to the snail, there's a porpoise close behind us and he's treading on my tail." This project is a porpoise treading on everyone's tail—costing everyone, benefiting no one. I suggest Mr. Chairman, that we had best walk a little slower on this one. I suggest it be returned for considerably further study until such time as the Federal agencies involved can give us a clear picture of what we are doing with our constituents' money.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, Congressman TUPPER and I have written Members of the House concerning the desirability of House approval of the so-called Dickey-Lincoln School projects in northern Maine. The full text follows:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to you to urge your support for the Dickey-Lincoln School flood control and hydroelectric project on the Upper St. John River in Maine as authorized under S. 2300, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This project which was strongly endorsed by President Johnson in a letter of transmittal to both the House and the Senate has passed the Senate and, of course, has been endorsed by the House Public Works Committee. It is our understanding that when this bill comes up for consideration this week an effort will be made to strike this project from the bill. In an effort to gain your support for this project and to correct misunderstandings which may have arisen we submit the following points for your consideration:

1. The Dickey-Lincoln School project has a benefit cost ratio of 1.86 to 1.

2. History has shown that Federal hydroelectric plants bringing low-cost electricity into an area have stimulated the demand for power from fossil fuel generating plants; i.e., plants using coal, oil, or gas, so that the demand for such fuel is enhanced.

3. In other sections of the country private utilities were violently opposed to hydroelectric projects at first but after they realized the benefits which accrued to them through the increased consumption of electricity brought about by the decrease in rates they began to cooperate with such projects. On the Upper Colorado River Basin in 1962, Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, negotiated a jointly constructed transmission grid with private companies to market public power on that river. Last year Secretary Udall again successfully negotiated a huge project integrating the electric facilities of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. Six private utilities, the city of Los Angeles, and the Department of Interior are participating in this history-making project and today the largest combine, comprising nearly all of the western utilities, is discussing with the Department of Interior the legitimate role each can play in meeting the future power needs of a 10-State area.

4. The alternate proposal of an atomic plant with pumped storage proposed by the Electric Coordinating Council of New England in its last-minute attempt to thwart the Dickey project does not stand up as indicated by the attached memorandum.

There is no question that nuclear energy holds great promise for the future. We think it should be developed just as we believe our fossil fuel resources should be developed and used. But we do not think we can casually dismiss the flexibility and compatibility of hydroelectric energy which complements rather than competes with thermal generating sources. The fact is that the Dickey-Lincoln School project and its associated transmission system will help stimulate the aforementioned use of fossil fuel and nuclear energy in New England by lowering rates and increasing consumption of electrical energy thus requiring larger thermal generating capacity.

5. The Dickey project has been thoroughly studied since a survey was first authorized by President Eisenhower in 1956.

6. The project was thoroughly reviewed by the Federal Power Commission which gave the project a green light only after making the finding that there was no better alternate.

7. There is no question with respect to the need for this power. Even the opponents to the project admitted this need in hearings before the subcommittee.

8. Although the ratio of power benefits to flood control and other benefits of this project is very high, this is certainly not unprecedented in Congress especially where the need for low-cost power is acute.

9. As a long-standing policy, the Department of Interior does not discuss the marketing of power for any project prior to authorization by Congress. This policy is a sound one because no Member of the House would advocate the Federal Government committing itself to a course of action before the proper committees of the House and the Congress as a whole had approved that course of action.

10. All computations were made in accordance with Senate Document No. 97. Computations for the marketing of the power included load factor, capacity, and energy and repayment within 50 years which included both the cost of the project ($227 million) plus the transmission line ($73 million). All figures were studied and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

11. The project as the support of all appropriate executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers.

12. Power costs in New England are the highest of any region in the country; and there is no public power yardstick in any of the six New England States.

13. The Dickey-Lincoln School project would be located in an economically depressed area where, for example, 33 percent of the families have incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 48.6 percent of the population is over 65 or under 15 years of age. This is an area where wholesale rates for electric energy average three times what Dickey-Lincoln School rates, delivered would be.

14. The price of power from the Dickey-Lincoln School project will be less than one-half that of the average charge in New England today.

15. All of the power projects in the bill are good projects in meeting the benefit-cost tests laid down by the Congress. Dickey-Lincoln School compares very favorably with these other projects.

We believe this project to be in the best interests of Maine, New England, and the country and therefor seek your support.

Sincerely,

WM. D. HATHAWAY,
Second District, Maine.
STANLEY R. TUPPER,
First District, Maine.

POWER COMPANY SUBSTITUTE FOR DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT IS MISLEADING, COSTLY, AND NOT CAPABLE OF SERVING THE SAME PURPOSE

(By the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association)

The Electric Coordinating Council of New England (ECCNE), which numbers the principal investor-owned electric utilities in that region among its membership, claims that it has devised a substitute project which purports to be superior to the Dickey-Lincoln School development and to thereby render the latter unnecessary. The proposed substitute plan, which was released scarcely a week before the House hearings, combines a pumped storage peaking plant in western Massachusetts and a nuclear baseload plant on Long Island Sound in Connecticut as an alternative to the all hydro Dickey-Lincoln School development in northeastern Maine. The companies' alternative is assertedly designed to parallel Dickey-Lincoln School, but it fails to do this in a number of important respects.

Dickey and Lincoln School would together develop 794,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Of this amount, it is estimated that 635,000 kilowatts of capacity would be used for peaking purposes with an annual output of 330 million kilowatt-hours; the remaining 159,000 kilowatts being used to produce an annual 695 million kilowatt-hours of energy at 50 percent load factor. Net annual generation would therefore be 1,025 million kilowatt-hours.

The big block of 635,000-kilowatt peaking capacity would be available to any electric system which operates its own generation. Its cost delivered would be $15 per kilowatt per year as compared to $23.50 per kilowatt/year estimated by FPC to apply to new power company plants scheduled for New England. The 50-percent load factor energy could be sold to co-ops, municipals, and power companies which do not own any generation. It would be firm power for them. It would cost them about 7 mills/kilowatt-hour delivered. They now pay from 13 to 20 mills.

The ECCNE proposal embodies a pumped storage peaking project of 612,000 kilowatts in western Massachusetts and a 159,000-kilowatt portion of a 700,000-kilowatt nuclear plant on Long Island Sound. The combined project would develop approximately the same capacity and annual energy as Dickey-Lincoln School. But the similarity between the two plans ends there.

First of all, very little transmission is associated with the ECCNE proposal; $4 million compared to $73 million in transmission for the Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project. Thus, the ECCNE plan is geographically no substitute because its power could not be delivered to Maine, New Hampshire, or eastern Massachusetts. Moreover, the purported economics of the ECCNE proposal are not supported by present or anticipated experience in the electric industry, as the following points make clear:

1. The $80 per kilowatt cost of ECCNE's pumped storage peaking capacity is lower than anything built in modern times. At chapter 7 (p. 121) of its National Power Survey, entitled "Peaking Power," the FPC states: "Economically attractive projects usually cost $100 to $120 per kilowatt or less." Experience has taught that this estimate, though essentially accurate, may be slightly liberal.

The Taum Sauk project of the Union Electric Co.—the most recently constructed pumped storage project of significance—has 350,000 kilowatts installed and cost $50 million to construct, for a cost of $143 per kilowatt. Projects in Colorado, one under construction and one proposed, anticipate costs of $107 per kilowatt and $137 per kilowatt, respectively.

In the light of the above, a realistic cost for the ECCNE pumped storage project would be $110 per kilowatt, or $8,820,000; 38 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

2. The energy costs for the 311 million kilowatt-hours expected to be generated from the ECCNE pumped storage project also seems low. A widely accepted rule of thumb for pumped storage units requires 3 kilowatt-hours of offpeak steam energy to pump water uphill in order to get 2 kilowatt-hours of peaking energy from the storage reservoir when the water is allowed to run back down through the turbines. Since electric energy, even at wholesale rates, would be bargain priced at 4.62 mills per kilowatt-hour, claimed by ECCNE to be its pumping cost per kilowatt-hour, it seems clear they have only counted on using one unit of energy for pumping in order to get one back. Therefore, the proper energy costs for the pumped storage project would not be 4.62 mills per kilowatt-hour as claimed by ECCNE, but 6.93 mills per kilowatt-hour. As a result, the total energy costs for the project would not be $1,480,000, as claimed, but $2,230,000; 50 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

3. The ECCNE plan assumes a nuclear capacity cost of $114 per kilowatt and fuel cost of 1.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, both of which figures seem extremely low. Also, the choice of a 700,000-kilowatt plant as the source of such capacity which would be available from Dickey-Lincoln School is inherently unfair for a unit cost comparison.

(a) At chapter 5 of the National Power Survey, entitled "Nuclear Power," table 31 indicates that a 500-megawatt plant constructed as late as 1970 would have a cost of from $132 to $152 per kilowatt. Fuel costs for such a project at that time might be 1.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(b) The Advisory Committee Report No. 15 of the Survey, entitled "Nuclear Development," states in its table 1(A) that the installed cost of a 500,000-kilowatt nuclear unit in 1967 will vary between $160 and $185, with fuel costs running 1.9 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(c) We respectfully point out that no project approaching the size of 700,000 kilowatts, which the ECCNE proposal envisions, has yet been built in this country. The best known plant approaching that size is the Oyster Creek plant of the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. which would have a nameplate 515,000-kilowatt unit installed at a cost of $68 million, averaging out to a per-kilowatt cost of $132—16 percent above the $114 per kilowatt estimate by ECCNE. Another plant under construction is the Nine Mile Point Plant of the Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp. which would develop 500,000 kilowatts installed at a cost of $90.2 million; this averages out to a cost of $180 per kilowatt, 58 percent above the ECCNE estimate.

In view of the above it is likely that the 159,000-kilowatt plant would cost $180 per kilowatt, while the 700,000-kilowatt plant would cost $130 per kilowatt, both substantially higher than the ECCNE estimate.

4. The ECCNE estimate of associated transmission is only $3,950,000, as against an estimated $73 million for the Dickey-Lincoln School transmission. The ECCNE proposal thus envisions transmission construction being limited to the immediate location of the plants. Citizens of Vermont and of New Hampshire and of Maine would apparently be limited to existing transmission line voltages, most of which, at 115 kilovolts, have only one-ninth the carrying capacity of the proposed 345-kilovolt Federal lines. Thus, the ECCNE proposal, in terms of its location, is not a substitute for the Federal project.

5. There is no assurance whatever that any savings derived by the companies from their proposal would result in lower power bills for the consumers of New England. During the hearings, the ECCNE company witnesses refused flatly and repeatedly to answer questions as to the rate at which power from their proposed substitute would be sold. We know that the Federal power would be cheaper than any existing or potential source in New England—$15 per kilowatt per year plus 3 mills for energy.

In the light of the above facts, without which it cannot be properly understood, the ECCNE proposal is reevaluated and compared with the Dickey-Lincoln School projects in tabular form in the appendix. The table shows quite clearly that the annual cost of the ECCNE proposal would far exceed that of Dickey-Lincoln Schol. The ECCNE projects are also deficient in that they would not provide the average annual $1 million benefits to flood control, area redevelopment, and downstream hydro projects attributable to Dickey-Lincoln School.

In short, Dickey-Lincoln School will provide more benefits at lower cost than the ECCNE alternatives. And, of overriding importance to the people of New England, the benefits of the low-cost power to be developed at the Federal project will flow through to the consumer.

APPENDIX

Economic comparison of Dickey-Lincoln School with ECCNE-proposed "Substitute"

	ECCNE proposal [1]		Dickey-Lincoln School
	With 700-megawatt nuclear plant	With 159-megawatt nuclear plant	
Fixed charges for peaking power (13.1 percent of $110)	$8,820,000	$8,820,000	
Energy costs for peaking power (at 6.93 mills per kilowatt-hour)	2,230,000	2,230,000	
Fixed charges for load factor power ($19.10 per kilowatt for 700-megawatt plant; $26.50 per kilowatt for 159-megawatt plant)	3,040,000	4,210,000	
Energy costs for load factor power (1.8 mills per kilowatt-hour for 700-megawatt plant; 2.2 mills per kilowatt-hour for 159-megawatt plant)	1,250,000	1,530,000	
Annual charges for transmission	600,000	600,000	
Total annual charges	15,940,000	17,390,000	$11,900,000

[1] Figures are those submitted by ECCNE corrected to reflect industry experience and FPC estimates.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to speak in support of the rivers and harbors omnibus bill that is presently before this body. I wish to take this time briefly to compliment the chairman and the ranking members on all the committees. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has so ably suggested, whenever this committee has an opportunity to work its will, I am convinced that the committee is one of the finest committees in the House.

During this past year we have been hit with disasters and tragedies throughout the Nation. Not only has this committee concerned itself with proposed legislation and recommendations to correct some of these problems in the future, but this particular committee has gone out into these various areas and actually seen firsthand some of the problems. Chairman JONES of Alabama has demonstrated great leadership, compassion, and understanding as he directed many of these visitations. It was my privilege to accompany him on most of these trips. We toured most of the United States wherever disasters took place with these committees. I can say without any reservation that this was one of the greatest morale boosters to the people in the areas affected, at a time when they really needed it the most, that I have ever seen.

This bill would authorize some of the most needed public works projects, and it should have the support of every Member of this body.

Like most of the bills that come before us, there are areas in which we have disagreements. I cannot say I support everything in the bill. But by and large, this is a good bill, and will be of great benefit not only to the Congress but to the entire country.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works and a member of the Subcommittee on Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control, which held more than a month of hearings on the bill, I believe I can testify with some degree of accuracy to the almost incalculable amount of human suffering and property damage that will be saved if these projects are completed.

Last winter my own congressional district suffered from a lack of projects such as these. I fervently hope a failure of foresight and planning will not allow this to happen again.

This past year we have seen the loss of hundreds of lives and many millions of dollars of property damaged by floods throughout our Nation. If we are to prevent similar catastrophes from happening each year, now is the time to authorize these projects so the final planning can begin.

I sincerely believe that we are discussing an area today in which Federal participation is right and proper. These projects represent the best in intergovernmental cooperation. It takes both local interest and Federal Government to bring any project to a successful conclusion. To my mind, that is how it should be.

The reasons why the Federal Government should participate in these projects are many. First, many of the projects are interstate in nature and, as such, properly belong in the sphere of activities of the Federal Government. Second, some of the projects deal with navigable waterways and they, too, are a function of our Federal Government because the Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over the navigable streams of America.

Finally, many of these projects require financial resources that are beyond the reach of local interests. Certainly the role of the Federal Government is to do that which cannot be done at a lower level of government. Included in this bill there are projects which could not and would not be undertaken if left solely to local interests, as the local interests have neither the financial resources nor the expertise to devote to these large projects.

Quite frankly, I wish that some of the States throughout the Nation would develop programs of public works authorization on their own, with respect to smaller community projects, in cooperation with the cities, counties, and local districts. This would be an example of our federal system of government working at its best.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies, for their excellent cooperation in preparing the preliminary plans for the projects in this bill. I personally have had the finest working relationship with these two agencies, and I am delighted to commend them from the House floor today. Certainly, interagency cooperation for multiple purpose project development must be the theme of this Congress as we offer legislation to advance the orderly development of this great Nation. This is our responsibility, and I am convinced our committee has done an excellent job in proposing this omnibus bill to the House for approval.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, there are several provisions in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill now before us which I believe make this an outstanding piece of legislation. At the outset, therefore, I want to express my appreciation for the work of the Public Works Committee and especially its Subcommittees on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors.

This year, more than most, we have experienced in this country the great destructive power of nature—both in the prolonged drought which has afflicted most of the populous Northeast and in the severe flooding which has devastated areas in the West. We have learned again that conservation, control, and development of our precious water resources is a matter of growing urgency, especially as our people continue to congregate in heavily populated urban areas and place an increasing strain on the capacity of State and local governments to provide these basic water resources. It is the purpose of this bill, therefore, to harness nature, to overcome the extremes of shortage and surfeit, and to make our water resources better serve the needs of our people. If there are unnecessary, unwise or low priority projects included in this or similar bills, then I suggest the proper approach is not to condemn the legislation with the broad brush of "pork barrel" but to identify the projects that lack justification and seek to delete them on the basis of their individual lack of merit.

Among the provisions in which I am especially interested, Mr. Chairman, are the following:

First, the authorization of a Federal flood control project in the Elizabeth River Basin. As recommended by the Corps of Engineers, and approved by the committee, this project will cost a total of $12,200,000, of which $9,769,000 is the Federal share. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.3, and the appropriate Federal and State agencies have given the project their unanimous approval.

As the committee has indicated in its report, the Elizabeth River flood control project is necessary. Severe and destructive floods have been a recurrent problem, especially in the densely populated, heavily industrialized section of the river basin that lies in Union, Hillside, and Elizabeth. The recommended improvements will protect the basin against the worst floods on record, both fluvial and tidal, and such flooding at current costs would cause damage estimated at $3,700,000.

This is a most worthwhile project, Mr. Chairman, and one that the governing bodies, private organizations, and the people wholeheartedly support.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the widening of the entrance channel to Kill van Kull from upper New York Bay. The committee considers this project to be urgent for the safe and efficient use of the channel, and those who are familiar with the importance of the channel and its essential role in the huge commerce of the Port of New York and New Jersey will concur vigorously.

This one entrance channel carries no less than 50 percent of the waterborne commerce of the entire port area—a greater volume of traffic than is carried by any other coastal port in the United States.

The narrowness of the present entrance channel has caused an increasing number of collisions, groundings, and near accidents, and conditions there are considered critical especially in view of the bigger, heavier vessels now using the channel to reach Port Elizabeth and Port Newark in Newark Bay. Recognizing this fact, the Corps of Engineers has separated the Kill van Kull entrance project from its more comprehensive review of the New York-New Jersey Channels and in March of this year recommended to Congress that the entrance be widened from 800 to 1,400 feet at an estimated cost of $2,581,000.

This project, Mr. Chairman, is vital not only in the interests of safety and convenience but also of the continued growth of one of the world's busiest port areas, the rapidly developing facilities along the shores of Newark Bay.

Third, Mr. Chairman, I refer to the decision of the committee, which it has noted in its report on the bill, to report an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill every year, rather than every 2 to 4 years. This is a highly welcome change, and I applaud the committee for making it. As the report points out, when the report of a proposed project is transmitted to Congress following enactment of an omnibus bill, it has meant

a further delay of 2, 3, or 4 years before the project is finally authorized—a delay which, in many cases, can be extremely costly.

One such case comes immediately to mind. The single most important current project in the whole New York-New Jersey port area—the largest in the world—is the overhaul of navigation channels in Newark Bay. This is the center of the greatest growth in the port area, focusing chiefly on the development of Port Elizabeth and Port Newark which, when completed, will be the largest terminals in the port. Waterborne commerce in Newark Bay already exceeds 10 million tons annually, with an estimated value of $6 billion.

The principal factor in the growth of the area's commerce has been the increase in the movement of deep-draft vessels which, in order to operate at capacity, require deeper and wider channels than are now available. The Corps of Engineers, which has completed its preliminary report on this project, is expected to recommend major improvements in the Newark Bay channels. Final transmittal of a favorable report has, however, been impossible prior to action on the pending bill. Without the announced decision of the committee to consider annual authorization bills, therefore, this extremely significant project would be consigned to several more years of limbo, and at a time when the improvements are critically needed. The Port of New York Authority alone is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in port facilities on Newark Bay. Port Newark now employs more than 4,500 people with an annual payroll exceeding $25 million. When completed, Port Elizabeth will employ an estimated 9,500 people earning more than $52 million a year.

These figures, I think you will agree, suggest the tremendous importance to the economy of our area of the proposed projects for the improvement of channels in Newark Bay. And for this reason, we are grateful to the committee for its decision which will save years in providing the improvements so badly needed.

Fourth, and finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to add my strong endorsement of title I of the bill—a triumph of imagination and determination, far and away the most important single effort so far devised in Congress to do something effective about solving the critical water shortage problem in the Northeast. This one title makes the present bill historically important and presents the Congress with an unprecedented opportunity to set in motion a series of studies which will result, hopefully, in the construction of a comprehensive, regionwide system of reservoirs, completely interrelated with each other and fully integrated with existing facilities. Such a system is our only assurance that on a long-term basis the most heavily populated, most intensely industrialized section of the United States will have enough water to meet its increasing and essential needs.

Consequently, I hope the House will give this new and far-reaching title the strongest possible support. And while I do not wish to be a part of what seems to be an interagency tug of war, or a battle for power over the development of the Northeast's water resources, I must express my deep regret that the administration, according to reliable reports, opposes title I. I know of no substantive reason for this alleged opposition, nor can I understand what seems to me the completely groundless opposition of the Delaware River Basin Commission. Title I simply authorizes the Corps of Engineers to prepare a plan to meet the Northeast region's future water supply needs. Every individual project resulting from the Engineers' study would have to go through the full authorization and appropriation process. The fears of the commission and, apparently, of the administration, appear in this light to be quite groundless.

I hope, therefore, that the House will reject any amendment to delete or substantially change title I. In particular, I hope we will not be influenced to transfer the authority to make the study and prepare the plan from the Corps of Engineers to another agency which may not possess the resources, the experience, the operating capacity or the legal authority to carry out this huge responsibility.

All of us, Mr. Chairman, agree that the time for action is now, both on a long-term and short-term basis. Title I represents a carefully calculated response to the long-term need. It would be very unfortunate to lose sight of our mutual objective and allow ourselves to get bogged down in essentially extraneous and irrelevant considerations and lose this great opportunity to get moving.

Tens of millions of people in northeast New Jersey, New York, Philadelphia, and the wide region surrounding this giant metropolitan center have been brought to the brink of disaster by the present drought. We simply cannot wait any longer to do what we all know must be done. We have paid lip service to the need during the weeks and months of the emergency. Now is the time to back up our words with our votes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield ?

Mrs. DWYER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey for the very effective testimony she presented to our Subcommittee on Flood Control on the Elizabeth River Basin project. She was one of the most persuasive witnesses who came before our subcommittee during the entire hearing.

Mrs. DWYER. Thank you very much. I certainly appreciate that remark.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee and the appropriate subcommittees thereof for bringing this bill to the floor.

The water problems of the Nation are becoming increasingly serious. This is the proper medium for seeking solutions to those problems.

I asked for this time primarily to discuss projects which have been recommended for authorization by the Corps of Engineers since the bill was reported. This organization has, as of last Friday, recommended the approval by the Congress of authorization for 12 additional projects. One of these is a project in which I am very keenly interested. It is the Gulf County Canal project which is found in the First District of Florida. It is not a costly project, the Federal share is something under a half million dollars, but it connects the Gulf Intracoastal Canal with the port of St. Joe and St. Joseph's Harbor, Fla., and as such serves a very important purpose to an industrial community. It would be my hope that these newly recommended projects could be included in the present bill. However, I am mindful of the fact that they total something over $150 million. I am somewhat reluctant to assume the responsibility of asking the committee to open the door for one, because I realize it is tantamount to opening the door for all of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee at this point. First of all, I am told that the committee proposes to have an annual authorization bill. I would certainly hope that this is going to be the case, because we have waited three years for the present omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill and that 3-year wait has been a very taxing and trying time for some of us who had meritorious and worthwhile projects which have needed authorization and construction. However, in addition, I understand the present bill carries language which permits the committee itself to authorize projects of less than one-half million dollars in cost without the necessity for congressional action. The Federal contribution to the project to which I refer would be $470,000. If I can yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, am I correct in the assumption which I stated?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. Your statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask my distinguished friend, who has contributed much to good legislation in this and other fields, whether it is the intention of the committee to handle expeditiously projects such as the one to which I have referred, which has been recommended and which is less than half a million dollars in cost so that there will be no necessity for these projects to have to wait for another omnibus rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is exactly the purpose. It is a great inequity and does great injustice. There are many projects of small and modest size which are completely worthwhile and about which there is no question whatsoever, but they have to wait for 2 or 3 or 4 years in the committee for an omnibus bill.

But through no fault of their own, year after year numerous projects are suggested, such as the gentleman has mentioned here, that are put in the "deep freeze." So our thought would be this, that the smaller type projects could be put right out. They would not be bypassing anything. They would have to meet all of the criteria and go through all the steps and the processes, and some of

them might take several years, such as any other projects may take.

We hope to have and we do intend to have an omnibus bill each year from now on.

Mr. SIKES. Certainly this will improve the procedure for handling these matters. The gentleman has been most reassuring. Before I yield the floor may I respectfully remind my good and distinguished friend that I am talking about the Gulf County Canal in Florida.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit a question to the chairman of the committee. As he knows, on the North Coast of California we were hit very hard by tidal waves. If I understand this correctly—and I should like his comments on it, however—with this new concept in the bill itself, those projects on the North Coast of California will qualify to come before the committee each year, providing they qualify otherwise?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I concur in what the gentleman has said. As I understand, the Gulf County Canal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and the Corps of Engineers. I do not think there will be any problem getting it authorized expeditiously.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for my distinguished friend's comments. It is a needed project which I trust will have early and favorable action by the committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in support of S. 2300, authorizing funds for river and harbor and flood control projects, I want to call attention to two projects which are included in the bill and deserve approval.

And in this connection I want to commend the Committee on Public Works. I know that members of the committee have spent many many hours of diligent, thorough, and hard work studying the various projects submitted to them. The American people owe much to this committee.

The Gulf Coast of Alabama has some of the finest fishing and recreational potential of any coast area of the country. Part of the area has been developed, but other parts need improvements so that the potential which is there can be fully realized in terms of both added economic strength and in terms of recreational values which the country is coming more to appreciate with each passing year.

One of the important commercial fishing and pleasure boat areas along the Gulf Coast of Alabama is Bayou La Batre which extends from the sea inland approximately 24,000 feet to the town of the same name. The town of Bayou La Batre is 30 miles southwest of Mobile.

The channel should be maintained at a depth of 9 feet by previous authorization. However over the years it has been difficult to maintain that depth, with the result that serious difficulty has been encountered by craft of various kinds in negotiating from the community to the sea.

Many individuals depend on this navigation for their livelihood. An extensive industry in shrimp, oysters and other seafood revolves around the fishing activity made possible by the Bayou itself.

In July 1964, the Corps of Engineers recommended a 12-foot channel for Bayou La Batre. To implement that recommendation an item of $262,000 is included in this bill.

The 12-foot channel will bring solid opportunity for development along the waterway and in the community of Bayou La Batre. People there have been master boat builders for generations but many orders have been lost for the lack of a satisfactory access to the sea.

There are no better fisherman anywhere than in this area. And yet when they come in with a successful catch they often must unload in neighboring areas because they cannot get into their own port without tearing the bottom out of their boats.

The improved navigational opportunities will mean recreational advantages as well. Sport fishing and pleasure boating are swiftly increasing as major recreational activities.

And while a few years ago the country considered recreational needs to be unimportant or even foolish, the time is fast coming when we consider adequate recreational facilities to be essential to the economy as well as to the full life which we as Americans seek.

The second item I want to mention today is the Perdido Pass channel. This channel is located about half way between Mobile and Pensacola, and forms part of the boundary between Alabama and Florida.

The bill provides $625,000 for work in establishing a 12-foot channel between Perdido Pass and the Gulf of Mexico, and a 9-foot channel from the Pass to Perdido Bay, and also a 9-foot channel into Terry Cove.

There has been no Federal project involved here before. The navigable depth in many places is less than 4 feet. And craft requiring greater depths must use routes several miles away. Only in calm weather can the Perdido route be used at all without hazardous conditions.

The project includes non-Federal participation in the amount of $471,000. Local interests are especially interested in this improvement as a means of realizing the great commercial fishing potential of the area and the sport fishing and pleasure boat activities as well.

Again I want to commend the work of the Committee on Public Works and I welcome this progress toward needed improvements in the Bayou La Batre and the Perdido Pass channels.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support S. 2300 and commend the able chairmen of the committee and its subcommittees for the splendid work they have done.

This bill looks to the future and endeavors to meet, in statesmanlike manner, the needs of our country in the years ahead.

A good example is afforded by inclusion in the bill of approval for Shidler Reservoir, on Salt Creek, in Oklahoma.

This reservoir is urgently needed by the communities of the area, and their future growth is dependent upon its construction.

I do not know of any community that has worked harder in support of a project than the city of Shidler, under the able leadership of Mayor G. L. Willis and civic leader Ben Jones. I share their conviction that the growth of their area will be advanced tremendously by Shidler Reservoir, and major flood control and recreational benefits will accompany the water conservation benefits.

I hope this bill will be overwhelmingly approved and an early start on the Shidler project will follow.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support S. 2300 and the language thereof as reported by the House Committee on Public Works. I entertain confidence in and great respect for the members of the committee, individually and collectively.

Emblazoned on the wall of the Chamber of the House of Representatives, directly above the chair occupied by the presiding officer, are the words of Daniel Webster:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

In the favorable consideration and passage of legislation such as we are now considering, we are following the instructions and the imperative of our predecessor, Mr. Webster. The consideration of the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill is always one which brings us to a closer realization of the great strength of the natural resources of the United States.

Under the criteria established by the Congress and by the rules of the Committee on Public Works, the benefit-cost ratio of the projects listed in bills of this character must exceed unity. That means that every dollar authorized and eventually appropriated for the development of these natural resources is an investment in America and its future.

May it always be so, so that each of us in our time may have contributed to the development and strengthening of our land, of our resources, and of our future.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the foresight and long-range vision which the Committee on Public Works has demonstrated by including the language of title I—Northeastern U.S. Water Supply—as appears on pages 37 and 38. All of us are well aware of the dangerous situation which has developed in New York and other parts of the northeastern United States, which has been caused by severe drought conditions.

An entire area comprising more than 20 million people is experiencing a dangerously low level of usable water supply for personal, residential, commercial and industrial purposes. This is a problem which affects not only the areas and the people involved, but affects the entire Nation.

The careful study and the excellent judgment of the committee is clearly demonstrated by the directions to prepare and plan to meet the long-range water needs of the United States. I strongly support this section as it is strong evidence of the necessity to develop and conserve our water resources.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] in expressing approval of the committee's action in placing into this bill this new concept of treating our Nation's critical water problem.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for including in his statement supporting this bill his approval of title I of the bill.

I believe there is no more important problem facing the United States today, at least domestically, than the short water supply that is developing year after year in various sections of the country.

I further believe it is well for us to recognize the problem in the northeastern section of the United States where the great population centers lie, and direct our initial studies to the problem in this area.

I am glad to join the gentleman not only in support of the entire bill but in speaking enthusiastically on this new concept in an effort to solve the water needs of the Northeast United States and with the hope that we point the way to avoid such critical circumstances in other sections of this country.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, while approving of the bill as a whole, I particularly approve that portion contained on lines 11 through 21 on page 44 of the bill as reported to the House. Together with my colleagues in the other body, I have sponsored and advocated this legislation in fulfillment of a promise which I made to my friends and neighbors when I first campaigned for election to Congress. I believe in river development as a proper Federal function and as part of a comprehensive plan of resource conservation and the development of hydroelectric power.

I believe that I have the unanimous support of the Georgia delegation in the House in behalf of the authorization of the two Flint River projects which are designated as the Lazer Creek project and the Lower Auchumpkee project. On their behalf, as well as on my own, I respectfully urge the passage of this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert on many subjects. I seldom trespass upon the time of this House in floor debate. However, if there is any subject upon which I do claim more than a modicum of general knowledge, it is the subject of the Flint River, Ga., and its development. The Flint River is as dear and close to me as the Chattahoochee must have been to our great Georgia poet, Sidney Lanier, when he wrote the "Song of the Chattahoochee." The Flint River rises a few miles north of my home. It flows through my native county and is crossed by the very highway on which my residence is located and where four generations of my family have lived and made their home. From earliest boyhood, I have fished and swum in its waters. I have hiked, picnicked, camped, cooked, and slept along its banks. I have floated down it and portaged over its shoals from the place where it is wide enough to accommodate a boat to its confluence with the Chattahoochee.

Ever since the Congress became conscious of the great potential of river development, I have envisioned multipurpose development of the Flint River within and adjacent to the Sixth District of Georgia. Upon the passage of this bill today, the authorization of the second and third dams of the three-dam complex will become a reality.

The House of Representatives authorized the construction of the uppermost of these three dams, known as the Spewrell Bluff Dam, in the act approved December 30, 1963. This legislation today authorizes the construction of the two companion projects which form this complex.

The falling waters of the Flint River will be utilized three times within 30 river miles for the generation of hydroelectric power. These dams will harness flood waters and prevent flood damage over thousands of acres and many miles of river basin. These three dams will form the necessary reservoirs which will provide a continuous flow of deep water and will eventually make possible navigation of the lower reaches of the Flint River above Bainbridge and as far north as Albany, Ga., as a part of the plan designed by the Corps of Engineers in 1963.

In 1836, the General Assembly of Georgia authorized a study of the Flint River with regard to navigation and appropriated $10,000 for the study. If electricity had been generated by hydroelectric plants at that time, no doubt the authorization would have included a reference to the study of the hydroelectric potential of this river.

In 1872, still before the era of electricity and hydroelectric power, the U.S. Congress authorized a Federal survey of the Flint River from Albany, Ga., to Chattahoochee, Fla.

In 1939, the civil works division of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army began preparation of a general plan for full development of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River System. In 1948, the Congress implemented this recommendation with general legislation authorizing further study and development of this system.

In 1961, the Corps of Engineers announced the beginning of a survey of Flint River to include a study of multiple hydroelectric sites.

In August 1962, the Corps of Engineers completed this study and prepared a report which, on September 20, 1962, was transmitted to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. The letter transmitting a favorable report of the detailed plan for comprehensive development of Flint River, Ga., to eventually include five dams, recommended immediate authorization of the upper three dams, namely: Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee projects. The following day, September 21, 1962, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK referred this report and letter to the Committee on Public Works and ordered it printed with illustrations as a House document. It was designated House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, 2d session.

Beginning in 1908, non-Federal agencies considered the hydroelectric potential of this river. Easements and other properties have been acquired in possible anticipation of such development, but no further action was taken.

As a candidate for election to an unexpired term in the 83d Congress, I spoke of the development of this river and its basin, and pledged that if elected I would seek the enactment of authorizing legislation. One of the first actions taken by me after becoming a Member of this House was to generate additional activity which resulted in the preparation and submission of the report of the Chief of Engineers which is incorporated in House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, which report forms the basis for this authorization.

To the best of my knowledge, this section of the bill reported by the Committee on Public Works meets with the practically unanimous approval of the people of the sixth and adjoining districts. Local interest, local officials, and local citizens have joined together in endorsing and asking approval of the Flint River development. I am confident that I can give assurance that the local cooperation required under the terms of the report which accompanies this bill will be enthusiastically provided.

I urge the authorization of this development on the Flint River, Ga., within the language approved by the Committee on Public Works. The comprehensive plan of water resource development of the Flint River Basin consists of five dams and reservoirs for general approval as a guide to the resource development of the Flint River Basin. Congress authorized the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir as the first step in the recommended plan in the 88th Congress, and such authorization is contained in the Flood Control Act approved December 30, 1963. The language contained in

S. 2300 authorizes the Lazer Creek project and the lower Auchumpkee project.

The authorization of the Lazer Creek project and the Lower Auchumpkee project to include a dam and reservoir at each location constitutes the next logical step in this comprehensive plan and development, and these projects and their authorization are consistent with orderly processes and the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives.

I wholeheartedly approve this entire plan and urge authorization at this time of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 567 of the 87th Congress.

The comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin has the potential of further developing the economy of this entire area.

Flint River rises 350 miles above its mouth and 1,000 feet above mean sea level in the southerly outskirts of Atlanta, Ga., the largest city in the Southeast. It crosses the fall line, marking the division of the Piedmont Plateau and the Coastal Plain, between river miles 230 and 285, falling 370 feet in 55 miles. It joins the Chattahoochee River to form the Apalachicola River, 108 miles above Apalachicola Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.

The power needs of the Flint River Basin are increasing rapidly and continuously. Power from projects on the Flint River could be used in power supply areas 23 and 24 as designated by the Federal Power Commission. Annual flood damages below the fall line total $180,000, and productive values of farm and urban land will increase substantially when flood control is provided.

The estimated costs of the two projects are as follows: The Lazer Creek project is estimated to cost $41,028,000, of which $40,378,000 are Federal funds and $650,000 are non-Federal funds. The Lower Auchumpkee project is estimated to cost $49,295,000, of which $48,275,000 are Federal funds and $1,020,000 are non-Federal funds.

The benefit-cost ratios of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects are 1.2 and 1.3 respectively. The total annual benefits of the two projects is $5,885,000, compared to annual charges of $4,737,000.

Broken down into each individual project, the annual benefits to be derived from the Lazer Creek project total $2,725,000. The annual benefits of the Lower Auchumpkee Dam and Reservoir are shown by the engineers to be $3,160,000. By comparison, the annual charges of the Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee projects are $2,228,000 and $2,509,000, respectively.

The benefit-cost ratio of each of these projects is well above the standard and criteria heretofore established by the Committee on Public Works and the Congress.

In addition to the economic benefits, the beauty of a truly delightful area of Georgia will be multiplied by the reservoirs which will come into being as a result of this legislation. The often-muddy waters of the Flint River will be transformed into the clear blue lakes which will find their ways up creeks and into coves at the place where the northernmost Spanish moss meets the southernmost trailing arbutus. Citizens of our time and generation, as well as those who will take our places, will enjoy the facilities and the beauty, as well as reap the economic benefits of the projects which will be authorized by this legislation which we shall pass today.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely and enthusiastically support this legislation, and urge its passage by the House of Representatives.

I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his contribution and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my colleague and longtime friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors, Beach Erosion, and Flood Control Act of 1965.

S. 2300 is the first legislation of this nature which has been reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Public Works during my service as a Member of this body. It has been my pleasure to appear before the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittees. In this way, I have seen the manner in which the members of this committee apply themselves to the consideration of and development of the legislative language which is incorporated into a bill of this kind. From them and through them I have learned the standards and criteria which individual projects must meet in order to be included in legislation and recommended by the Committee on Public Works.

A careful study and analysis of this legislation as a whole and by its component parts leads one to the unmistakable conclusion that the great public works which come into being as a result of legislation sponsored by this committee are investments in the future of America.

The individual projects contained in this legislation are naturally of great importance to the Representatives and people of the area in which the respective projects are located. In addition to such local significance as each item in this bill may have, altogether this bill represents the result of careful study and demonstrated good judgment in this development of the resources of this country and the conservation of those resources.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill in its entirety. I especially support that section which appears under the heading of Flint River Basin—Georgia—in the exact language in which it was reported by the committee.

The general plan of development of the Flint River Basin includes five river development projects, three in the upper reaches and two in the lower reaches of the Flint River. Of the three upper dams, the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir was authorized in the act approved December 30, 1963. This bill now under consideration will authorize the next two projects, Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee, in the order recommended by the Chief of Engineers, as reported to the Congress in House Document No. 567, 87th Congress.

A map study of Georgia will quickly show that each of the three above-mentioned projects are located in districts other than the Second District of Georgia. However, more river miles of Flint River are located in the Second District of Georgia than either of the other districts through which the Flint River flows.

One purpose of the three upper projects is to provide water storage and holding effect in order to maintain the constant source of water to fully untilize the lower reaches of the Flint River and to justify the authorization of two additional projects in the lower reaches of the Flint River, known as Raccoon Creek project and Lower Vada project. It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will recommend and that the Congress will authorize early development of the two downstream projects.

With this in view, and in the firm belief that the Flint River projects which are contained and described in this legislation are of great and lasting importance to the State of Georgia and the Nation, I wholeheartedly support the provision of S. 2300 and especially endorse the authorizing language for the two Flint River projects.

I respectfully urge that the bill be passed and that any amendments to that portion relating to the Flint River, Ga., to change the language recommended by the Committee on Public Works be rejected.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I expect that today there will be considerable discussion concerning some parts of this omnibus public works bill. The power-producing sections are creating the controversies and should bring the entire House to question why they are there at all.

There is little question about the beach erosion, flood control, river dredging, and similar projects of the bill designed to benefit the citizens of a number of areas, and doing for them something which neither they nor private business can do independently. But once again the time of the Members of the House is to be consumed in protracted debate about power-producing projects that have no business being there in the first place.

My patience begins to wear thin when I see an endless stream of Interior Department reports attempting to indicate that there are power shortages here, high costs there, and insufficient power for what has been intriguingly called preference customers—although I am at a loss as to why some preferred people in this land should have a special advantage in getting power produced by facilities which were paid for by all the taxpayers.

And yet, at the same time I am told on the very best of authority, that our investor-owned electric companies are outstripping the Russians and the world in power supply and technology—something in the order of 3 or 4 to 1—and gaining every day. Other than some limited technological instances, I know of nowhere in this great land where people are throwing their electric switches and not getting instantaneous results—24 hours a day, 365 days a year. I am not an expert on the electric utility business, but it seems to me that these companies have been doing a truly outstanding job in anticipating what the American people will want tomorrow, and next week, and a decade from now for their electric requirements—and then going out and providing them.

The costs of power? What is it, Mr. Chairman, that leads some of the agencies of the administration, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, to constantly challenge the costs of electric power? Certainly there are parts of the Nation where electricity costs more than in others. There are also places where coal and bread and oil and butter and pork and chickens cost more than in some others. Yet, so far as I know no one has seriously proposed that the Government go into the oil business or the butter business.

Maybe I do not understand the economics here, but it seems that something is awry somewhere. The costs of most of these other items to the consumer has gone up and we make no attempts to inject the Government or offer subsidies to the poor consumer. At the same time the electric industry has been constantly reducing the cost of its product and we attempt to rush in and improve its performance by massive doses of Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, I pose a serious question to the Members of the Committee of the Whole. How many products can you name that cost your constituents less today than a decade or two ago? There are very few indeed, but electricity is one of them.

Certainly everyone wants to continue that trend. We might think about, as well, ways to spread and accelerate that trend to other products—it might well be a more worthwhile expenditure of the House's time to do that than constantly to berate and encroach on an industry that is the Nation's largest taxpayer.

Let me take just a moment more to point out exactly what I mean. Examining that Dickey-Lincoln School project in this bill leads me to actual astonishment. Can it really be true that we are being asked to authorize some $300 million in expenditure for a project that will be obsolete when it is built? Are we truly being asked to give our blessing to a project that will be detrimental to other parts of the country and will do nothing to lower power costs in New England but will provide only temporary assistance to the depressed parts of the State of Maine? Can there really be people who feel the Congress of the United States is foolish enough to say "yes" to a project that will slow down the development of nuclear power in New England, the best hope in generations for lower cost power for all the people of that area? Are we really in the process of spending $300 million to land another blow at Appalachia and its coal industry when such a short time ago we appropriated money to help this very area.

What this project will really do is to fill part of New England's growing needs for power with an overly expensive project, which may produce power more cheaply than obsolete steamplants, but which will produce more expensive power than nuclear or coal plants that can be built today. The benefits will be concentrated on so-called preference customers. The majority of New Englanders will get this power on a—you can have what is left over—basis. If a company tried to give the economies of a new low-cost plant to a few preferred customers, the New England regulatory commissions would promptly put a stop to the practice. But the Federal Government is immune from State regulation and by constructing this project can give preferred treatment to a few, while taking away part of the New England companies' load growth, a load growth which—without Federal intervention—would permit companies to build new low-cost facilities and spread the benefits over all New England.

The Flint River project is bad enough, several of the other power projects border on the unsound, but this massive project suggested for Maine is a tremendously expensive stalking horse for the now discredited Passamaquoddy project. It is a horse that I do not care to buy or even ride. If we find ourselves authorizing such a massive part of this Quoddy project, what is to stop us next year or the year after from buying the whole scheme? The original estimates were in the vicinity of over a billion dollars. But, apparently, there still remains some semblance of economic logic with us to cause, at least, its delay. Instead, a new horse appears, but its teeth are not much better than the shoddy Quoddy nag. Perhaps to the people of Maine it is a gift horse and not to be looked in the mouth. But to the rest of the Nation it is a poor buy indeed.

Mr. Chairman, let us be honest with one of America's greatest sources of strength—our electric industry. Let us be honest, too, with the people of Maine. Let us reject this St. John River project—as it should be rejected by all the rules of logic—and then let us do something for the people of Maine that makes sense. Something that will have a lasting benefit for Maine and the rest of New England. Let us return this St. John River project to the committee or even better, eliminate this dead horse once and for all.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the development of the Flint River Basin is of great importance to me.

The comprehensive plan for the development of the basin consists of five dams and reservoirs. The Spewell Bluff Dam and Reservoir has already been authorized by the Congress as the first step.

This omnibus bill contains the second step, the authorization of the Lazer Creek and Lower Ochumpkee Dams.

Three of the four counties in which the two dams are located are in my district, the Third District of Georgia. Most of the waters of the proposed reservoirs lie in my district. And I want to say that the citizens of my district are overwhelmingly in favor of the prompt development of this river.

With the development of this great natural resource, the citizens of the Third District will reap the benefits of additional peaking power, of much needed flood control, and of a recreational area in one of the most beautiful sections of the South.

The total annual benefits of the projects as determined by the Corps of Engineers are $5,885,000, compared to annual charges of $4,737,000.

In my opinion, the development of the Flint River will have a long-range significant effect on the growth of our State and our region, and I wholeheartedly support the adoption of this portion of the bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to ask one or two questions with reference to the John Martin Dam and Reservoir and the permanent pool which is to be authorized by language contained in this bill commencing on page 53, and ending on page 54. The John Martin Reservoir and the permanent pool, not to exceed 10,000 acre-feet, are discussed on page 74 of the committee report. This dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936. Since May 31, 1949, the waters of the Arkansas River impounded behind the dam are controlled and apportioned by the Arkansas River Compact and administered by the Arkansas River Compact Administration as established by the compact.

The administration consists of three members from Colorado, three members from Kansas, and an ex officio Federal member who acts as chairman. Two of the Kansas members, Mr. Logan N. Green, of Garden City, Kans., and Mr. Carl E. Bentrup, of Deerfield, Kans., reside in my congressional district, and along with Mr. R. V. Smrha, chief engineer, Division of Water Resources, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, have expressed some concern about the permanent pool provision. They are principally concerned with protecting irrigation interests downstream from the dam and particularly in the State of Kansas.

I take this time to ask whether or not the establishment of this permanent pool of some 10,000 acre-feet will in any way affect the rights of the irrigators now in the State of Kansas?

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to point out that the bill on pages 53 and 54 states specifically "the rights of irrigators in

Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River Compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph."

That is reiterated even more strongly in the committee report. Therefore it is the clear intention of the committee that the rights in these compacts will in no way be diminished or reduced by this particular section of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Do I understand there have been no field hearings on this particular project?

Mr. BALDWIN. There have been no field hearings, but we did hold hearings in Washington on this project.

Mr. DOLE. It is then the clear intent of this committee not to diminish the present rights of the downstream irrigators.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman. My concern is that Kansas water users are not deprived of any portion of the water to which they are presently entitled under the terms of the compact; and while I understand the language in the bill clearly indicates their rights will be protected, it does seem that some provision should be made to insure that in actual practice the rights of the irrigators are preserved. Certainly the interested parties in Kansas have no objection to all possible utilization of available waters, but we cannot approve any form of supplemental agreement without formal sanction of Congress and the original negotiating parties. In other words, the compact is the controlling instrument notwithstanding anything contained in the bill or the language of the report. Again, I thank the gentleman from California for confirming the clear intent of the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY] 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, concern has been expressed in upstate New York regarding the possibilities that waters which ordinarily would flow into Lake Ontario, one of the already low-level lakes would be withheld under the farsighted Jones plan.

I think two points should be made for the RECORD in this connection. One is that each project outlined in the plan would return here to the Congress for authorization so that we would review each project. Second, as the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], has assured me this whole plan is based on the theory of riparian rights so that if one State found a project would injure its riparian rights, it could object.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this points up a very urgent problem, the problem of low levels in the Great Lakes and the concern that is expressed is occasioned by the fact that the levels of the lakes are already low. The only answer is to put more water into the lakes. There is only one place that this water can come from and that is from Canada. Until recently the Canadians were very loath to consider any plan involving the diversion of any of their waters into the Great Lakes to raise the water levels and to flush out pollutants. Recently, however, there has been a change of attitude.

I recently introduced a resolution which would declare it to be the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States refer this matter to the International Joint Commission with a request that the so-called great replenishment plan for channeling rivers that flow into Hudson Bay and rechanneling them into the Great Lakes be studied and that studies be undertaken with reference to the economic feasibility of such a project as well as the engineering problems involved.

I would hope as we consider the idea of diverting waters from the Great Lakes to the drought stricken Atlantic seaboard, we in the Congress give serious consideration to the binational plan of the United States and Canada, to divert these northern Canadian rivers that now flow out and gush unused millions of gallons of water daily into Hudson Bay to be rechanneled into the Great Lakes to raise the level and flush out pollutants, and thus provide for the increasing water needs of the States of Illinois, Ohio, and New York.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, may I rise in support of the pending bill, S. 2300. I would call the attention of this committee to two very distinguishing characteristics of this bill, characteristic of the entire bill but particularly applicable to the projected development of the Trinity River Basin. One is that the bill meets every criteria of good legislation and good public works in that it ties into a package both local, State, and Federal participation in those areas of responsibility of the governmental subdivisions involved.

I rise also to call attention to the very distinguishing feature that this recognizes the need for looking ahead and keeping pace with the growth of our economy and the growth of our population so as not to let any portion of our community or any portion of the Nation to lag behind in some of the facilities that are so necessary and essential to their well-being.

May I thank the Members of this Committee and the members of the subcommittees who have worked so diligently on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge most respectfully the support of this Committee for this very fine bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

If section 201, which is included in the bill, survives today, I wonder if the gentleman would tell me whether it would apply to a specific problem in my district. As the gentlemen knows, a community in my district, Klamath, was entirely wiped out during the floods of 1964. There is a very serious emergency, in that the State of California is actually holding up the construction of a highway which they intend to use for levee purposes in order to protect the new location of the community against future floods. The Corps of Engineers now has a project underway to relocate the community, and the matter will come before the committee once it has cleared the agencies. The State of California has already approved the project and it is scheduled to clear the agencies in the near future.

Might I have some assurance from the Chairman that as soon as the project clears the agencies, and as soon as the bill is passed, we can have a hearing on the project shortly after the first of the year?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I can only speak for the subcommittee. Certainly it would be our intention to address ourselves to any proposition that would be raised in the prospectus transmitted to us by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. We have a very short season for construction in this northern part of California and I want all of the Members of this House to understand the problem of the people of the Klamath area who are at the mercy of the Congress for assistance in this case. The future of these people and their community is at stake. They desire to relocate the site of the town. I have been working closely with the State of California, the Del Norte Board of Supervisors, and the people concerned, as we do everything within our power to advance this critical project.

I will be following up on this request in our committee.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a bit of time to discuss with the Committee, particularly my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], details relative to the Mankato and North Mankato flood control project. I might comment at this point that my good friend of long standing, the senior Member of our Minnesota delegation, has been most helpful to me in this matter. I am most appreciative. His counsel and help I know are also appreciated by the citizens of Mankato and North Mankato.

Many Members will recall the devastating floods that hit Minnesota earlier this year. At Mankato much of the city was under water. Terrible damage resulted from one of the worst floods in Minnesota's history. The story was reported nationwide.

Back in 1958, a flood control project at Mankato and North Mankato was approved by the Congress, but the local jurisdictions failed to take advantage of the authorization because of some difficulties in meeting the requirements under the bill for local participation. But last spring the flood hit, and the damage was devastating. I know there was a big four-motor plane which flew all the way from Washington carrying officials who wished to observe the flood conditions. I know that politicians shoveled to fill sandbags, flash bulbs were flashing all

over the place, and promises were made of many things which were going to be done.

It was my belief that in view of the fact that this project had been authorized, and in view of the fact that the local people have already started to build levees to prevent a similar disaster next spring, language should be included in this omnibus bill which would permit them to take credit for the dollars they presently spend against the requirement for local contribution. This is the purpose of the bill which I introduced earlier in this session. This is a fair request. I hope it will be granted.

I have in my hand a letter from the Army Engineers dated September 8 in which they indicate that they needed no further information upon which to base their report on my bill and had forwarded their report to the Budget Bureau for clearance. But I am advised that the Budget Bureau has not at this time made a report to the committee, and the committee is not at fault because the Budget Bureau did not submit the report. I was advised that the committee would attempt to put some language in the bill which would reach a project such as this.

I am wondering, if I might inquire of my good friend, Mr. BLATNIK, if there is any possibility that the provisions of my proposal could be written into this bill because I know that the gentleman's sympathies are with me, for we have discussed this matter. I might say to the Members of Congress that JOHN and I, way back in 1940, served together in the Minnesota Senate; so we have common interests as far as our State is concerned on projects such as this one.

Mr. BLATNIK. I say to my colleague, my very dear friend for many years, it has certainly been a pleasure to work with him on many important projects, dating back to our early days in the Minnesota State Senate.

The gentleman from Minnesota has explained the situation absolutely correctly. As he stated, I have been more than sympathetic. I have been anxious, in view of the urgency of the need and the readiness of the people there to do more than their share to meet the local participation on the project. I was most hopeful that we would be able to get this into the omnibus bill now before us.

We did ask the Corps of Engineers about this. As the gentleman knows, these projects must go through the regular procedures. In forwarding the project to the Bureau of the Budget, there were some modifications to the original authorizations, which apparently would increase the local cost. Instead of the estimated $50,000 or $60,000 under the original design for the project, with the additional improvements the local cost could be up to $200,000 or perhaps $300,000.

Mr. NELSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. As was explained to me, the Bureau of the Budget has not yet come up with a report on exactly what would be the local cost. It would be much higher than $50,000 or $60,000. Certainly it would be closer to, but probably not larger than, $200,000.

I have nothing more to say, except I have deep regret that the processing by the Bureau has not been completed. They have had this only 10 or 11 days, but certainly through no fault of ours and certainly no fault of the gentleman, who has been after us for months on this project. There is a crying need. There was a devastating flood which the people went through. I am sorry there is no more I can offer to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. I intend to offer an amendment to the bill, though I was earlier advised not to do so. I was also advised that the committee would attempt to do this. I am sure they would like to.

The thing which is—I hestitate to use the word "irritating," but it is true that I do not know of a politician in Minnesota who was not out there last spring, and I do not know where they found all of the cameras and all of the headlines.

This was a flood which was devastating. It was an emergency which could recur. The river is again rising. It is almost a flood situation now, with constant rain. They are putting in levees now. Some of those are being washed away.

It seems only fair, when the people are willing to dig into their own pockets to build the levees, that they should be given credit for what they have done when the Congress finally acts. We know we will get to that finally. Because of the delay, even this little time, it seems to me this is an emergency. Every politician of whom I know in the State promised to do something about it. Now we face the prospect of nothing being done. I feel we shall have failed if we do not do something at this time. I hope the Committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is hardly necessary to say that I urge support of this legislation, in view of what has happended in the past several days in my own congressional district in Louisiana, as related to Hurricane Betsy. You all know of this disaster. You have read about it in the newspapers. You have heard of it on the radio. You have seen it on television. It was highly dramatized by the personal appearance of the President himself, accompanied by members of the Louisiana delegation, the day after the hurricane struck the area.

In its wake, as Members well know, it left in excess of 70 dead and, according to the Governor of Louisiana, $1 billion worth of damages.

Practically my whole district in the lower section bordering on the Gulf of Mexico and the lower Mississippi River was wiped out. Town after town and community after community were laid bare; individuals losing their life's savings and their homes. It is hard to understand how they can recover from this disaster in their own lifetimes.

I mention this fact to you because of the urgency to focus attention on this needed authorization for a flood control system in this particular area. For many years now my distinguished colleague whose district abuts mine, Congressman BOGGS, and I have cooperated in urging the adoption of what is known as the Lake Pontchartrain flood control program. This program, which is authorized in the bill, through the understanding of the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who heard the testimony of my colleague and myself only a few weeks ago, was passed before our recent disaster. Not once did we think at that moment that such a terrible disaster as Hurricane Betsy would strike us, as we listened intently to the testimony of the engineers from the State of Louisiana and the Corps of Army Engineers who approved this project. I think it would not be stretching a point to indicate that if in the course of human events this project had been authorized several years ago much of this damage would not have occurred. Certainly many lives would have been saved. However, this is literally water over the dam. This is something in the past. We now come to the present and look to the future. I suggest that you take this one incident as an example, as a horrible illustration, if you please, of the necesssity and the urgency for expediting this legislation.

I am most pleased that in the future we can expect annual omnibus bills. I think the devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy has clearly demonstrated that we cannot wait nor postpone from year to year efforts and preparations to eliminate as far as possible that which has happened to us in Louisiana.

My distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has graciously consented to come to Louisiana over the weekend to see exactly what did happen there; to witness the devastation which is beyond description even by the most eloquent and adequate speakers or writers. The land was laid low, homes were razed, and people are still in evacuation centers as of today. All of this could not have been prevented. Certainly some of it could have been if we had only had in being and in effect this particular program authorized in this legislation and which my colleague from Louisiana and I have sponsored for so long a time. I do not wish to belabor the question or to trespass upon your time any longer, because it is not necessary. I express the appreciation of myself and the people who live in my community for the great assistance that has been given us at this moment by the Federal Government and the various Federal agencies. These people will be on this trip with our colleague from Alabama over the weekend. They will see for themselves exactly what happened. I hope remedial legislation will be offered not only in this area but certainly in more expansive measures. My colleague has already introduced some legislation in that regard. I think this is the time when we should look forward to the Federal Government to assist in areas which cannot be assisted by private enterprise, particularly insurance companies.

We have had wartime disasters. But what is more continuous, what hangs over our heads more permanently, are natural disasters. I have been living through hurricanes since 1915. This was the worst of all in our own State. Other States are being affected by tornadoes and floods.

I suggest that disaster insurance of this kind is what is needed. Also I suggest that we explore some means for alleviating the losses of and assisting those helpless individuals. Mighty as the Government is and mighty as has been its help, not one thin dime is to be given to these people down there. I do not advocate a grant, but I do take umbrage at any suggestion that help by the Federal Government will result in help to the individual, because it will not.

I ask my colleagues to give favorable consideration to and recognize the urgency of passing this bill at this particular time.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my sympathy for the situation of the gentleman from Louisiana, because those of us in the northwest part of the United States were affected in a similar way. With regard to the matter of a disaster insurance program he will be pleased to know that we are asking a Federal agency, possibly the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to conduct a study in depth and make a recommendation to the Congress, because I think he knows that those of us who have been affected by floods simply do not have any program that can be triggered into action to help the small individual who has lost everything.

I want to offer my support to him. I have already talked to the distinguished majority whip and offered assistance from my own experiences in California.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take just a few moments to express my appreciation to our distinguished colleagues, the members of the Public Works Committee, for their hard work and the fine job they have done in reporting S. 2300 to the House.

In addition to supporting the bill, and particularly that portion which affects the First District of Georgia, I wish at this time to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] in support of the Flint River project, as reported by the committee.

I would like to comment also on sections of this bill which are of vital interest to southeast Georgia. This, of course, is in reference to the inclusion of some $13 million for needed improvements at Savannah Harbor.

Since General Oglethorpe sailed up the Savannah River and founded Georgia's mother city in 1733, the Savannah Harbor has been the key to the development of much of Georgia. The harbor has made possible the development of numerous industries which depend almost solely on water transportation in their basic operations. The harbor is also important in the movement of military personnel and cargo for the defense of our Nation. The harbor has been used extensively during every war, and within the past month troops boarded ships at Savannah en route to Vietnam.

Although State and private organizations have spent millions of dollars on new facilities at the harbor in recent years, its future growth depends greatly on this authorization bill.

With all of the fine facilities now available at the port, large ships must still enter and leave the harbor partially loaded because of an inadequate channel depth. The present width of 500 feet in the bar channel and 400 feet in the inner harbor are hazardous as larger ships attempt to pass during the existence of fog, crosswinds, or other unfavorable weather conditions. In the upper reaches of the harbor, shipping is seriously hampered by the 200-foot width and 30-foot depth of the channel. This narrow channel makes movement at night extremely hazardous and ships cannot attempt to pass in the channel.

This bill would provide for widening and increasing the depth of the channel and for construction of additional turning basins.

In addition, the bill also provides for the construction of a tidegate and sediment basin which would greatly improve the harbor, and, at the same time, substantially reduce the annual maintenance by the Corps of Engineers.

Because of the somewhat unusual nature of this harbor, constant shoaling takes place along the main shipping channel. This shoaling is a continuous hazard to navigation and requires constant dredging of the channel. Construction of the tidegate and sediment basin would greatly reduce this problem.

In view of the importance of this legislation to my district and to other districts throughout the Nation, I urge that it be approved by the House.

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to stress my support for S. 2300 now under consideration by the House of Representatives. I am particularly interested in the Burns Waterway Harbor project contained in title II of the bill. When completed, this port will introduce a new era of economic prosperity and progress for the State of Indiana. It will represent the dreams of many people in Indiana who have worked for a port for many years. The State of Indiana demonstrated its faith in the potential benefits of a deep-water port on Lake Michigan when the 1965 legislature allotted $25.6 million to begin construction of the port's breakwater and the dredging of the harbor. This indicates the willingness of Indiana to invest in its own future.

The Burns Harbor project is incorporated in S. 2300 through the wording used in my particular bill, H.R. 50. It stresses the desirable feature of authorizing the Federal Government to make a monetary contribution to the State of Indiana as a means of financial aid for building the port. This approach to a Federal-State relationship is not part of the Senate's version of S. 2300. Yet, the idea of a Federal reimbursement of funds to a State for a public works project has precedent. The Army Corps of Engineers has participated in such projects many times in the past. What is really needed is a clearly defined policy to guide future projects of this type. However, at present, I strongly advise that the reimbursement feature be kept in the bill so that the State of Indiana might progress toward attaining this goal of a public port at the Burns Waterway.

The House version of S. 2300 also includes an additional paragraph—pages 84 and 85—which reads:

> Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

Mr. Chairman, this is a means of calling attention to the other side of a controversy which has been bothering Hoosiers for a long time. I am quite willing to accept this version of a "proviso" to show the importance of the dunes national lakeshore project. In fact, I have taken constructive steps to begin action on such a measure. The House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, chaired by my colleague [Mr. RIVERS of Alaska], will conduct field hearings in Indiana on October 2 and 3 to review the merits of a national lakeshore park in the Indiana Dunes area as set out in my bill, H.R. 51. This, I feel, indicates more measurable progress toward gaining a national park than using unnecessary provisos in an omnibus public works bill. However, if it will insure passage of S. 2300 in its House form, I am willing to accept the compromise proviso as worded in the House version.

Indiana is interested in gaining both a port and a national lakeshore park. In my opinion, the best place to begin is with expedient passage of this omnibus public works bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from a part of the country that now is and has in the past suffered severely under these conditions, I also feel that the committee is to be commended for the comprehensive job it has done on this bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of my 12th Congressional District in New Jersey know only too well that this had indeed been a long, dry summer.

To many communities of northern New Jersey, the specter of water rationing is no longer a mere threat. Some of my constituents have already begun to put into operation their own hurriedly

prepared conservation and water retention facilities. Indeed, in many communities we have returned to the rain barrel technique of what we thought were days gone by.

Our rich industrial complex of the Northeast need not have to rely on rain barrels, Mr. Chairman. Congress, therefore, should not hesitate to accept our responsibility in replacing the rain barrel with reservoirs and aqueducts. I am convinced that Members of this Congress in approving S. 2300 will provide authority for regional planning that will insure a water supply for the long-range needs of our northeastern communities.

This planning is a necessity not only to guarantee the best possible use of available resources, but to insure wherever possible that the specter of water-rationing will not for long haunt the thriving communities of the northeastern megalopolis.

It is my fervent wish that the majority of my colleagues in Congress support S. 2300 and the commitment to safeguard the future water supplies of our communities that have so generously contributed to the economic progress of the Nation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in general debate on S. 2300, argued that because the Dickey-Lincoln School project is located in the State of Maine, the low-cost power from it will be utilized to develop the industrial potential of that State at the expense of other States. Nothing could be further from the truth. He asks if this is a subsidy or an investment. The answer certainly is that this is an investment in the resources of Maine to the benefit of all our people.

These multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects are regional developments and in the larger sense are designed to benefit the Nation as a whole rather than any particular State or locality. Nor does it necessarily follow that merely because the industrial potential of Maine is developed that of other States is depleted. No modern nation in history has enjoyed the tremendous economic expansion and the rapidity of industrial development which the United States has experienced in the past few years and which we all hope will continue in the years to come. This unprecedented growth means that all areas which possess the necessary raw ingredients will enjoy the prosperity of increased industrialization. It is not a matter of one State developing industry at the expense of another State, but rather of providing basic elements essential to the continued industrial development of a region. Where these elements are available, the economy will develop.

One of these indispensable elements is low-cost electricity. The simple truth is that New England electricity rates are the highest in the Nation and those of the State of Maine the highest of the New England States. No sustained coherent and well organized plan has been developed by the existing private power interests to bring about lower cost electricity for the residential, commercial, and industrial consumers of the region which are paying these rates. To the extent that the Dickey-Lincoln School development will make available 694,000 kilowatts of electricity at a wholesale rate lower than that anywhere available in New England at the present time with the possible exception of St. Lawrence power in Vermont, it will supply a basic element necessary to revitalize the economy of the area. History demonstrates clearly that the advent of low-cost Federal power creates an element of competition in the power industry which inexorably results in all power suppliers offering parallel service at lower rates. No New England private power company will be put out of business or damaged by the Dickey-Lincoln School project. Competition—yes, but damage—no. As a matter of fact, private power companies located close to Federal power dams have enjoyed a rate of growth and a rate of profit which exceeds that of the industry as a whole.

Finally, with respect to the specific charge that authorization and construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School project will result in a transfer of industry from southern New England to northern New England, I respectfully but urgently emphasize that the plan for this project, as envisioned by the Department of the Interior, includes construction by the Federal Government, if necessary, of a transmission line from the project site to Boston, Mass. The only purpose for including this line in the project plan is to assure the people of all New England States that the benefits of the project will not be limited to Maine but will be made available on a regionwide basis.

There is, therefore, no merit whatever in arguments and contentions to the effect that the Dickey-Lincoln School project would result in the industrial development of one State at the expense of another. There is plenty of peaking power in the project for many States—there is no intent on the part of any one State to exercise a monopoly on its use.

For too long New England has complained about the benefits of low-cost power in other regions. Someone once said it is better to light a candle than to complain about the dark. Let us light this one candle and banish some of the high-cost darkness from New England.

I will submit other facts favorable to the Dickey-Lincoln School project before debate closes on S. 2300.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished majority whip [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my distinguished colleague from the First District of Louisiana has graphically described the damage inflicted upon our State by this devastating hurricane.

Upon returning here last week I made a report, attempting to estimate at least to some extent the amount of damage. Even then the amount of damage was very difficult to estimate. We are very fortunate indeed that the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman JONES, and his colleagues on this great committee, are going to our State and will be working over this weekend so they can ascertain just how bad and how devastating this natural disaster has been.

Mr. Chairman, this has been, in terms of loss of property, the worst natural disaster that we have ever experienced. In terms of the loss of life, it has been much less tragic than many other storms that we have experienced.

In 1893, for instance, as the result of a hurricane there were 2,000 people lost in the State of Louisiana. And, again, as late as 1957, if my memory serves me correctly, there were 500 people drowned in southwest Louisiana in a hurricane which hit Cameron Parish.

Mr. Chairman, in this last hurricane it is estimated that between a quarter of a million and one-half million people were evacuated from Congressman HÉBERT's district, from Congressman WILLIS' district, mine, and others in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, whereas, there is nothing one can to do bring consolation and comfort to the people who lost their lives in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana, at least we can take consolation in the fact that we have progressed to the point where rather than losing 2,000 lives or 500 lives in a hurricane much more devastating in its impact, we lost less than 100 lives.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, much remains to be done. Fortunately, we learn from experience, even though the experience may be as gruesome as this one.

It has only been recently that Congress has authorized hurricane studies. There are many areas of the country similarly exposed, as is our own. Hurricanes are not limited to Louisiana. Hurricanes have hit every State on the gulf coast many times and every State in the Atlantic area and in the Northeast. One of the most devastating hit the area of the great State of Massachusetts—I see our Speaker sitting here—in the year 1938.

So, Mr. Chairman, this has been a matter of continuing and constant research. Fortunately, as a result of previous hurricanes, particularly the devastating 1947 hurricane, the Corps of Engineers, working in close collaboration with this distinguished committee of this Congress, has already perfected a hurricane protection plan for southeast Louisiana and that plan is incorporated in this omnibus rivers and harbors bill which we will be voting on hopefully today. It is a comprehensive plan. It is one that may have to be reviewed in light of the experience of 10 days ago, but it is the opinion of the Corps of Engineers that had the plan been in effect the damage from floodwaters would have been incalculably less than has been experienced.

As a matter of fact, we have examples to demonstrate that. In 1947 a heavily populated area in my own district, similar to the one that was flooded by Betsy in Mr. HÉBERT's district, was flooded out. Fortunately, we had a special project.

Whereas there was more water on that levee this time than last time, not one drop of water inundated the homes of these people in East Jefferson parish. This demonstrates better than any words I can utter the wisdom of the Congress in considering and adopting these flood control and other projects designed to conserve the resources of our country and to protect our people from disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I get considerably annoyed, as I am sure most of you do, when I read the trite and ill-considered expressions oftentimes by people who know little about what they are speaking, in which they describe this bill, for instance, as a "pork-barrel" bill, one that apparently they think has had little or no consideration. All of us know that each one of these projects is carefully reviewed by a whole host of Government agencies. Then we finally authorize, and after authorization we must go through the long, deliberate process of obtaining appropriations, where again these projects are reviewed. I do not know of a single project that has been approved in any part of our country since I have had the privilege of being here that has not added to the wealth of our Nation and returned twofold or tenfold what we spent.

This very project which will be built in southeast Louisiana, largely in the constituency of my colleague from the First District, has a 17-to-1 ratio. That means for every dollar spent by the National Government there will be $17 in benefits to the people who live in that area.

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

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

Mr. KEOGH. I am sure our distinguished majority whip knows I have consistently in my service here supported these projects. But I would like the Committee to know, as little traveling as I usually do, I did have an opportunity a few years ago of viewing in person the Hoover Dam. And, Mr. Chairman, I left that place determined that so long as I am a Member of this body I shall support such worthwhile projects.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Let me deal for a moment with a very important matter that my distinguished colleague from the First District of Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the distinguished gentleman from California, touched on; namely, where a hiatus exists in our disaster laws. We have done a remarkable job in disasters in this country, and the expedition with which every branch of the National Government, working in conjunction with our State government and our city and parish governments, came to the aid of Louisiana, is something I will be eternally grateful for, as I am sure all of the people of Louisiana will, and should be.

Let me characterize some of these areas of assistance. To begin with, the port of New Orleans is the second largest port in the United States. The amount of damage at that port is great. In the port many ships were damaged. Several were sunk. Two modern automated ships that were almost completed were sunk, and each one of them cost about $12 to $14 million. Many barges, very expensive barges, were grounded and sunk. Many of the facilities of the port were absolutely wrecked and many suffered great damage.

In a matter of a few hours, the Office of Emergency Planning was there. Under the disaster relief legislation, most of those facilities can be rebuilt under programs that the Congress has approved. In addition, public schools, public installations, sewerage installations, drainage, water works and public buildings are all eligible for direct grants.

So you get down to two areas and I am sure they are the areas that need help probably most of all. No. 1 is the individual homeowner whose home was flooded and who is unable to purchase commercially or from the Government any type of flood insurance because no such thing exists because the risks are so high. This, of course, is what the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from California were referring to.

The other is with reference to the farmer, particularly the small farmer who carries a tremendous burden. Even the aid which is now available through the SBA and through other agencies of Government, unfortunately is limited so far as farmers are concerned. So I would hope that this terrible disaster that affected not only my State, but other States as well, and the disaster which occurred in California in the latter part of last year and other disasters that have occurred would not only teach us the great benefit and value of this legislation that we are considering today, but also will be the vehicle through which we can fill the last remaining gaps in the disaster programs of our National Government.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate and commend this committee on the fine and outstanding job they have done in reporting this legislation to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this rivers and harbors bill which we are considering today has a special meaning for me. Its importance for the safety of more of our citizens is all the more poignant in view of what I have seen in recent days. I refer to the devastation brought to my State of Louisiana by Hurricane Betsy.

Several of my colleagues in the Louisiana delegation and I accompanied President Johnson to my State the day that Hurricane Betsy struck south Louisiana. The President had a firsthand look at the human misery and the destruction caused by this monster storm. He pledged the full resources of the Federal Government to bring all manner of aid to the victims of Betsy.

I spent that same weekend touring the Metropolitan New Orleans area and the parishes in my district. What I saw was awesome, and terrifying. Death, destruction, anguish—all were there. One-hundred and twenty-five-mile-an-hour winds whipped tidal waves of more than 7 feet over and through the Mississippi-to-gulf tidewater channel; the industrial canal and over and through back levees in the area. After this nightmare, I also saw the courage and determination of the people of New Orleans and of south Louisiana to rebuild, and to do so as quickly as possible. I was particularly heartened by the efficiency and dispatch with which the President mobilized the agencies of the National Government to bring broad assistance and relief to the people of my State. The cooperation between all levels of government to ease the suffering, to clear the debris, to begin to rebuild was, and is, stirring. Man's humanity to man has been displayed countless times in the wake of this terrible hurricane. It has been done in the spirit of Christianity and brotherly love. Gov. John J. McKeithen opened his home in Baton Rouge—the Governor's mansion—to families made homeless by the ravages of this storm.

Mr. Chairman, Hurricane Betsy certainly was the most devastating hurricane to strike southeast Louisiana in this century, and probably the worst one, in terms of total property damage in the entire history of my State.

I daresay all of us in this House would much prefer that preventative measures, such as the navigation and flood control projects in this bill, were perfect, were foolproof, so as to prevent the loss of life, the injuries and destruction of property which occurred in Louisiana, or has occurred in other States. Of course, it is impossible that our preventative measures against major disasters will be perfect. But through our skills, we can improve them, we can make them superior and more extensive than they are now. That is the purpose of this authorization bill. That is the reason members of the Public Works Committee and the Corps of Engineers have worked closely together to give to our people of this great Nation more extensive and superior protective projects.

In the United States, Mr. Chairman, we have achieved more than any other nation in controlling and harnessing to our good use the great rivers, streams, lakes and other bodies of water in our country. Through the ingenuity and foresight of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the wisdom of Congress, we have approved and constructed many navigation and flood control projects across this land. We have done so, not only to control the destructive force of some of our bodies of water, but also—and more importantly—to improve them to our good use. We have built deeper channels to increase commerce and improve navigation on our waterways.

We have built harbors; we have provided, through locks and levees, through damming up and through opening or diverting waterways, the means for increasing commerce by inland boats and oceangoing vessels. We have accomplished much in this field to strengthen our country and enhance its progress and prosperity.

Navigation and flood control projects—their construction and maintenance—are absolutely necessary for the growth and development of the United States, Mr. Chairman. This is a good bill; this is a most worthy bill, and I am confident that the House, in its wisdom, will approve the projects included in it.

In light of the havoc caused by Hurricane Betsy to south Louisiana and to Florida and other areas, I should like to cite one existing project of the Army Engineers in the Lake Pontchartrain area. I am very proud of the success of this project. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the protection levee, built by the Army Engineers after the terrific hurricane of 1947, to keep east Jefferson Parish free of lake waters in any hurricane. This levee has been erected along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain from the Orleans-Jefferson line to St. Charles Parish, and it has proved to be remarkably effective.

The central force of the 1947 hurricane included the New Orleans area, and I lost an aunt in that terrible storm. But the destructive swath of the hurricane included the New Orleans area, and I know firsthand what devastation that storm brought. I was a young Congressman then; and the impact of what I saw has remained with me very vividly. It was rekindled by the horrors of Betsy.

The 1947 hurricane dumped tons of water on east Jefferson Parish, up to a depth of 8 feet and as far back as two and a half miles from the lake. Some 39 square miles in Metairie and in the rest of east Jefferson were inundated. Some $4 million in property damage was suffered by the people of east Jefferson alone; and the total property loss in the Metropolitan New Orleans area was more than $6.5 million.

After the 1947 hurricane, I was determined to do everything I could to provide floodwater protection for the people of east Jefferson Parish. By working with Senators ALLEN ELLENDER and RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, we obtained authorization for construction of a protection levee there. And we have worked to obtain on a regular basis the necessary funds to build and to maintain this protection levee. Today this levee is more than 80 percent complete. This strong barrier has kept Lake Pontchartrain waters out of east Jefferson in the hurricanes of 1956, Flossie; 1964, Hilda; and again with Betsy this year. The effectiveness of this levee is full proof of what can be done. The value of this levee emphasizes the need for a larger, more extensive hurricane barrier all along the south shore of the lake and part of the north shore, so as to protect the citizens of Orleans, Jefferson, St. Bernard, St. Charles, and other parishes; and to provide greater protection in the area below New Orleans in St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes.

As Members of the House know, the total property damage to public and private property in Louisiana alone—not to mention Florida, Mississippi, Alabama—will exceed $1 billion, according to an estimate by Governor McKeithen. In 7 major hurricanes to hit southeast Louisiana since 1900, some 800 people have lost their lives. The terrible hurricane of 1893 brought death to some 2,000 people.

One of the projects in this bill—the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project—is designed to provide the Metropolitan New Orleans area and southeast Louisiana with more extensive, stronger hurricane and flood protection. The project calls for the erection of a huge hurricane barrier wall along the south shore of the lake, and on part of the north shore; and the construction of new levees, or the improvement of existing ones, in the Mississippi River area east of New Orleans and below the city. The approval of this project will reduce greatly the dangers of flooding, particularly in New Orleans itself, which came in Betsy's wake.

In brief, the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project will provide:

First. A full levee and floodwall barrier along the south shore of the lake, together with repair and reinforcement of the existing seawall at Mandeville on the north shore;

Second. That this huge barrier include a navigation gate and flood gates in the Chef Menteur Pass to the east of New Orleans; a lock and floodgates in the Rigolets Pass to the east of New Orleans; and a multiple-purpose lock at the lakeward end of the inner harbor navigation canal;

Third. A levee and a floodwall barrier along the southeast side of the area to prevent tidal surges from Lake Borgne into Lake Pontchartrain;

Fourth. For the Chalmette area, a total of about 17.3 miles of new and enlarged levees, extending generally along the southerly banks of the gulf intracoastal waterway and the Mississippi-to-Gulf outlet to Bayou Dupre and thence westerly to the Mississippi River levee at Violet;

Fifth. A lock in the inner harbor navigation canal near Seabrook to prevent water velocities hazardous to navigation in the canal, and the increased salinity in Lake Pontchartrain; both this Seabrook lock and the levee for the intracoastal waterway and the Mississippi River tidewater channel would help control tidal surges into the lake and also augment the hurricane barrier across Pontchartrain's south shore.

I do not pretend to say, Mr. Chairman, that this project to protect southeast Louisiana from hurricane floodwaters is perfect. But I am confident it will accomplish much to prevent loss of life and property destruction.

For one thing, my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Congressman ROBERT JONES, who is chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and is a recognized authority in this field, pointed out in the committee report on this rivers and harbors bill that the ratio of benefit to cost for the Lake Pontchartrain project is $17 for every $1 spent to build it and maintain it.

This is one of the highest benefit-to-cost ratios ever estimated for any flood control project presented to the Public Works Committee, according to Congressman JONES. The cost of this worthy project will be about $84.8 million—with the National Government providing about 70 percent of the total or about $56.9 million, and the parishes in south Louisiana involved providing about $27.9 million.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and other members of the Public Works Committee, have agreed, Mr. Chairman, to take a firsthand look at the destruction wrought by Betsy in south Louisiana this weekend; and to take testimony on the total property damage in Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi from public and private officials. My colleagues, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. WILLIS, and I will accompany Mr. JONES and other members of the Public Works Committee, including Mr. GRAY, of Illinois, Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER, of Iowa, and Mr. SWEENEY, of Ohio. There may be other members who will join us, Mr. Chairman, on this important mission.

We will conduct a hearing on Saturday in New Orleans, and on Sunday in Baton Rouge, the State capital city. We will hear testimony on total property damage with two principal views in mind:

First. To ascertain whether it is desirable to recommend to the Congress that special legislation be enacted immediately to provide extra financial assistance and relief to the victims of hurricane Betsy in all four States; such financial aid would augment and supplement that now being provided by President Johnson through his Emergency Disaster Relief Fund; and

Second. To determine whether a recommendation should be made to the Army Corps of Engineers that the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project should be reviewed with the thought that as its construction is progressing, the project would be expanded, modified and improved to give more extensive hurricane and flood protection to the people of southeast Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. JONES' committee has the authority to do these things; and I and my colleagues from Louisiana and I dare say all the people of my State, are most grateful to Mr. JONES for his generosity and his thoughtfulness in agreeing to go to Louisiana and conduct these hearings. We will be most appreciative for his advice and counsel in this matter, once he has made an onsite inspection of the devastated areas and heard the testimony of public and private officials. I am confident that the result of this inspection trip and these hearings will be most fruitful, and will bring both added help to Betsy's victims and greater hurricane protection for southeast Louisiana.

I am pleased to report also, Mr. Chairman, that the House is receiving for this important mission the full and complete cooperation of some 10 or 11 Federal agencies which have been directly engaged in bringing assistance and relief to the victims of Betsy. Representatives of these agencies and departments will join us in journeying to Louisiana for the inspection and the hearings. Some of them will testify, along with their field officers who have been stationed in Louisiana since Betsy struck. Those agencies to be represented by high-ranking officers include: the Department of Agriculture; the Bureau of Public Roads; the Economic Development Administration—arm of the Commerce Department; Housing and Home Finance Administration; the Army Corps of Engineers; the

Maritime Administration; the Small Business Administration; the Red Cross; the U.S. Public Health Service; the Office of Emergency Planning, and maybe others. I know they will give to the Congress and the people of Louisiana and the other States involved the best of their advice and counsel, and the maximum in the form of assistance and relief—something they have been doing in a magnificent way since Hurricane Betsy hit south Louisiana on September 10 and 11. I am proud and pleased that representatives of these fine agencies are going to join in this worthy undertaking for the benefit of Louisiana, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

I frankly think that in the design stages of this project, when construction planning is being refined through funds to be provided by the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate, there should be an extensive review of the project, keeping in mind the erratic course of Hurricane Betsy and the ravages of that hurricane. I think it would be constructive if the Army Corps of Engineers, as they have done in the past, could review this project, with a view toward expanding it or modifying it. If they find, in their wisdom, that this hurricane barrier plan, as proposed in this bill, is not adequate, is not as good as it should be, then I am confident that the Engineers will work diligently to improve the project. There is no doubt that Hurricane Betsy points up the need, too, of accelerated action to begin the construction of this sweeping barrier plan for the Metropolitan New Orleans area. I am confident that in this session of Congress, the first planning funds for this project will be appropriated; my colleagues and I from Louisiana are working toward that end.

I am also pleased to insert into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a fine front-page story from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., in the issue of this past Sunday, September 19, 1965. The article was written by Mr. Clarence Doucet, and in it, he provides a clear word picture of the status of the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity project, and what this fine project includes. Mr. Doucet's article follows:

HURRICANE PLAN 2 YEARS OLD; MIGHT HAVE CUT OFF FLOODS—$56.9 MILLION IN BILL COMING BEFORE HOUSE

(By Clarence Doucet)

Already 2 years old is a recommended hurricane plan by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, which, had it been carried out before Betsy, might have prevented disastrous flooding.

Federal funds for the plan, costing $84.6 million, are included in the omnibus bill on rivers, harbors, and flood control which the House will consider this week.

Prof. Chester A. Peyronnin, Jr., Tulane University engineer and specialist on hurricane damages, served as a consultant to the U.S. Engineers on the hurricane protection plan design.

He says completion of the study was delayed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission who required assurance that any plan would not adversely affect the fish life in Lake Pontchartrain.

OUTLOOK GOOD—BOGGS

United States Representative HALE BOGGS has said the outlook is good for obtaining the first appropriations from Congress this year to begin planning the construction of the hurricane barrier project.

Getting the Federal funds is only part of the problem.

The Federal Government agrees to pay about 70 percent of the cost, or $56.9 million. Those funds are in the bill before the House.

The remaining $27.9 million must be put up by the State and the parishes.

Even after the money became available, it would take about 10 years to fully implement the plan.

DESIGN FOR PROTECTION

The plan is designed to protect the New Orleans area against a "design" storm, the type officials say comes only once in a century.

Two years ago when the plan was announced, a newspaper headline warned: "Hurricane Could Flood Most of New Orleans."

It was pointed out in the report that in the case of a "design" storm that Chalmette would be under at least 10 feet of water, and that water would be over the tops of automobiles.

The problem of how to deal with a "design" storm, or her real-life counterpart is solved, according to the report, by a system of gates and control structures to keep water out of Lake Pontchartrain as well as a string of high levees to protect the remainder of the area which would be threatened by water by any of the various inland waterways.

CONFIDENCE OF WORTH

Professor Peyronnin, Jr., is confident that had the hurricane plan been completed before Betsy, flooded areas at the most would have experienced "a little spill" that would have caused water in the street, but little more.

He further asserts that construction of the levees which would have prevented much of Betty's damage could be done in 2 to 3 years.

While there was not time to prevent Betsy from causing damage, speedy action by Congress and State and parish governments can lend some insurance against future storms leaving the area as devastated.

The Engineers call their creation Standard Project Hurricane, and to it they have added the course they believe would be most dangerous to the city. It is a course several miles east of the 1915 hurricane.

BARRIER PROPOSED

Recommended is a barrier to keep hurricanes from forcing more water into Lake Pontchartrain than the lake can handle. This would cost about $65 million, or about the same amount it cost to build the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge.

The plan calls for control structures where Lake Borgne flows into Lake Pontchartrain at Chef Menteur Pass and the Rigolets.

The Engineers discarded the possibility of increasing the height of levees on the Lake Pontchartrain lakefront because they would have to be so high to withstand a 12-foot tidal surge.

This is what the plan would do:

The Rigolets: Where Highway 90 crosses this major opening from the gulf to Lake Pontchartrain a concrete control structure, earthen dam and navigation lock would be constructed.

The 1,450-foot control structure with 23 huge vertical lift steel gates to permit or shut off tidal flow would be on the New Orleans side of the channel.

LOCK 84 FEET WIDE

The lock, 84 feet wide by 800 feet long would be open continually to pleasure craft, commercial vessels and tows except under abnormal tide conditions and would be on the other side of the channel.

The open water between the two would be blocked off with an earthen dam.

Chef Menteur Pass: The Chef Menteur would be closed off with a dam where it meets Bayou Sauvage. The bayou would have a dam across it.

Navigation channels, 12 by 100 feet, would be dug to allow entry to the lake from both the bayou and the Chef. A floodgate would allow free flow of tidal waters except in emergency situations.

Chef to Rigolets Dike Levees: A 9-foot levee would run from the Rigolets to Chef Menteur and from the Chef Menteur to a present New Orleans East levee.

The levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and its link to Highway 90 would be enlarged and the Industrial Canal levees raised about 3½ feet.

A new levee would go up along the lakeshore between the Bonnet Carre Spillway and the St. Charles-Jefferson Parish line, with a lateral levee along the parish line itself.

Existing levees along the New Orleans lakefront would be raised 2 feet. East of the Industrial Canal, a new 11-foot-high levee would be constructed all the way to South Point (South Shore).

NEW 16-FOOT LEVEE

A new 16-foot levee would be constructed for more than 13 miles along the south bank of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet to Bayou Dupre and then along the bayou to Violet. (This is the back edge of the protective ring that would be provided for Chalmette and other St. Bernard areas.) No levee exists at present, although the report indicates a 6-foot-high spoils bank.

Industrial Canal: The Engineers think it is important to construct a navigation lock where the canal meets the lake to prevent hurricane surges from entering the lake through the gulf outlet, which joins the canal.

The project would be funded under present gulf outlet authorizations.

North Shore: A concrete wall and strengthened seawall would be built at Mandeville, where considerable flooding would take place if Standard Project Hurricane hit.

Standard Project Hurricane is given a specific course. It approaches New Orleans from the south, crossing the coastline west of the Mississippi River mouth and curves northeastward over Lake Borgne.

PREVENTION POSSIBLE

Peyronnin says the Betsy flooding could have been prevented by this plan via the higher levees along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and around Chalmette which would have either prevented or minimized the overlap of floodwater in those areas.

The proposed control structures where Lake Borgne flows into Lake Pontchartrain and the Industrial Canal could have kept the surplus water confined to Borgne.

He also said Pointe a la Hache on the east bank and Port Sulphur, Empire, Buras, and Venice on the west bank would have been afforded considerable protection by the recommended improvements.

In those areas, he says, there would not have been flooding of any consequence. The reason is that present 8-foot levees would have been raised to 13.5 feet from Empire to Venice. Pointe a la Hache and Port Sulphur.

WOULD HALT TIDES

The raised levees along the Industrial Canal, Intracoastal Waterway and Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet would take care of rising tides which might move from Lake Borgne, he said.

No floodgates or locks are proposed for the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet.

As far as the possibility of flooding through wharf structures on the Industrial Canal, a dock board spokesman said the wharves are built 2 feet above the highest known water level.

Peyronnin said new boats slips built along the outer waterways will be sealed in some way and this is being studied.

UNITED FUND STORM AID PANEL FORMED

A special committee has been organized by the New Orleans United Fund to receive and process donations for aid of disaster victims, announced United Fund president, Francis Doyle.

J. Mason Webster of Tulane University is director of a committee established in response to many inquiries from individuals and corporations who want to provide emergency funds.

Webster said his committee will receive and process funds, including those designated for special agencies. The United Fund has the machinery to see that those agencies which urgently need additional funds will receive them from contributors, he said.

The Fund recently announced that neither it nor any of its member agencies would conduct a special campaign. Individuals and firms served by the Fund will be asked to give a "plus gift."

Webster said funds being received locally to support the work of 60 agencies including the Red Cross and Salvation Army are in excess of $3.873 million.

Serving on the Special United Fund Disaster Committee with Webster are Willis Penny, Dr. Leonard L. Burns, Robert E. Develle, Mrs. L. D. Hall, and Wilmer G. Hinrichs.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require to comment briefly on the remarks made by the gentleman from Louisiana and others and also the rights and responsibility of our committee in this area.

I am sure many Members of this body recall that when we had the education committee disaster relief bill that gives special treatment to the educational facilities including replacement of textbooks and maintenance, I raised the question: If you are going to do it relating to schools, why not consider giving treatment that is needed proper and judicious consideration to what should be done in all respects regarding disaster relief?

Now it is clear and it is true that in every instance of a disaster, I think our committee has accepted full responsibility and gone into the area. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that our committee for the first time in my memory, thanks to the good chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland, has gone into each disaster area, and the committee itself has inspected the damage and has indicated properly an interest in the matter and has tried to come up with some solutions regarding the need under existing law to provide additional authorizations for funds. But we are faced with the basic problem today and tomorrow that the gentleman from Louisiana raised and that is: what do you do with regard to areas not covered under present law relating to private homes and other public facilities for which under the present law only repair and returning to the previous condition of those public facilities is permitted? That is an issue in my opinion that this Congress has to face up to. I would suggest respectfully to our committee that now is not too late to act. I would suggest to the Committee on Public Works and to the Members present on the floor of the House that what we should do is that the chairman of the committee should appoint an ad hoc committee to act during the recess, if they ever let us recess around here, to study the basic laws relating to national and natural disasters to determine what our committee action should be in the coming sessions of Congress. We have to face up to this problem. We cannot put it off. I say in addition to that, of course, we have on the books today, and it was written a number of years ago, but never implemented, a national insurance program for natural disasters and hurricane insurance.

That has never been implemented. Why should not consideration be given to that program? I think our committee ought to get into this field now and study the basic law of those questions.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina such time as he may consume.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend each member of the great Committee on Public Works, particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, for their foresight, good judgment and their dedicated concern for the resources of the Nation, and the well-being of our people, in reporting to the House for our consideration here today this bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, for recreation, and for other economic purposes.

A total of 144 individual projects is included in the bill at a total estimated Federal cost of $1,970 million. The projects are located in 41 States, spreading their benefits to many millions of our people.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I am especially interested in the authorization, through this legislation, of the development of the Neuse River Basin in the great State of North Carolina.

This bill authorizes improvements in the Neuse Basin down to Pamlico Sound involving Federal expenditures totaling $29 million—$18,600,000 for the Falls Dam and Reservoir and $10,400,000 for the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity.

Mr. Chairman, the development of the Neuse River Basin will bring untold benefits to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina, which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, and to our State generally; and the economic stimulation will be felt over a wide area beyond the bounds of North Carolina.

This development is especially beneficial to the city of Raleigh, the capital of the State of North Carolina.

The rapidly growing capital city has an immediate and pressing need for an adequate supply of water for municipal and industrial uses. At present Raleigh gets its water from several reservoirs on the smaller creeks. The safe yield of the present source will soon be exceeded. The Falls Reservoir will store 45,000-acre-feet of water for this purpose. This will provide for Raleigh's needs for years to come. The 45,000-acre-feet of storage will provide Raleigh with about 100 million gallons of water per day.

The Neuse River Basin, situated in the eastern part of North Carolina, is approximately 180 miles long, with a maximum width of 46 miles. The Neuse is formed by the confluence of the Eno and Flat Rivers, about 8 miles north of the city of Durham, and has a drainage area of approximately 5,700 square miles.

The only existing flood control project of a permanent nature constructed on the Neuse by the Corps of Engineers is the cutoff at Goldsboro. This project consists of a flood channel across two adjoining bends of the river.

Major floods occur in the Neuse River Basin as a result of heavy rainfall from thunderstorms, hurricanes, and tropical storms. Such damage, according to the Corps of Engineers, averages about $1,256,000 annually.

The recommended plan of improvement of the basin is for construction of the Falls Dam and Reservoir in the interest of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation and for other purposes, and the recommendations include a general plan of improvement embracing 12 other reservoirs as a guide for future development of the water and related land resources of the basin.

The authorization in the bill before us today is for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, $18,600,000, and for the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity, $10,400,000.

At New Bern the Neuse River widens into a broad tidal estuary that empties into Pamlico Sound. Any sustained strong winds from the northeast quadrant on Pamlico Sound cause increased water levels in the Neuse estuary with frequent damaging results to urban and other developed areas. This legislation authorizes construction of a hurricane-tidal barrier at the Cherry Point-Wilkinson Point site on the Neuse, to include an ungated navigation opening.

Mr. Chairman, I note particularly the statements of the committee with respect to the authorizations on the Neuse, as follows:

Falls Dam and Reservoir: The committee recognizes the desirability of protecting the flood plains of the Neuse River from disastrous flood damage. The Falls Dam and Reservoir project would be an effective initial step in controlling floods and providing needed water supply, water quality control, and recreation in the basin.

New Bern and vicinity: The committee considers this project to be needed for hurricane protection at New Bern. However, the committee notes that economic justification is dependent on realization of benefits which, in turn, are dependent in considerable part on actions by local interest in regard to bridge construction and recreational use of the hurricane barrier slope. Accordingly, the committee considers it desirable that these benefits be reviewed carefully in connection with the evaluation studies normally made during preconstruction planning, taking into account the intentions of local interests at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Falls Dam and Reservoir is a first step in the development of the

land and water resources of the Neuse River Basin. The Corps of Engineers' report describes 12 additional potential reservoir projects in the basin which are to be studied in the future.

I would also point out that the local people in the Neuse River Basin are taking steps to solve some of the existing land and water problems. The Department of Agriculture has received nine applications for assistance under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended. Watershed work plans developed by these local organizations with assistance from the Department of Agriculture have been approved for five of these watersheds and assistance is being provided for the installation of improvements. The Department of Agriculture is now providing technical assistance to local organizations in developing a watershed work plan for a sixth watershed in the basin.

Other local organizations have also indicated an interest in developing watershed work plans and installing improvement measures in other watersheds in the basin.

I am greatly interested in seeing that the land and water resources of the Neuse Riven Basin are developed to their maximum potential. I hope that future studies in the basin will be carried out jointly by the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with State and local agencies. I am sure such studies will determine the most appropriate manner of providing for the development of the basin's resources through combinations of watershed projects under the provisions of Public Law 566 and additional reservoir projects as are considered in the Chief of Engineers' report.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the House that our people living in the basin are ready and willing to do their part in the Neuse River Basin development.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Florida for again pointing out, as he usually does, with his great skill, the overwhelming need to meet this particular disaster problem.

As the gentleman knows, in 1956 a disaster act was passed, but it has never been implemented.

I shall ask to include in the RECORD at this point a recommendation I have made to the committee in support of a study in depth on the problem of inadequate disaster insurance. I would like to work with the committee, and I hope that my recommendations will be followed.

The attached news release from my office on July 14, 1965, spells out guidelines for the development of an adequate natural disaster insurance program. This could be of value to the Members similarly concerned:

NEWS RELEASE

Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN today charged that a program of adequate aid to private individuals whose property is damaged in floods and other natural disasters "simply does not exist."

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Small Business, CLAUSEN said such a program is critically needed.

"It is to this end that I ask the Congress to direct its greatest efforts and talents," he said.

CLAUSEN said, "The millions of dollars spent by the Federal Government, the States, the Red Cross, Salvation Army, church relief, and the many great voluntary organizations, though sincerely appreciated, can by no means begin to provide relief for the mental anguish and personal losses suffered by those immediately affected."

The First District Congressman said that the National Disaster Act of 1956 takes care of political subdivisions and the public sector generally, "but the program to sufficiently handle the private sector problems simply does not exist."

The subcommittee, an arm of the House Banking and Currency Committee, held hearings last week on a series of bills calling for detailed studies of flood aid to individuals. It was hoped that such studies, one of which was proposed by CLAUSEN, would lead to national disaster insurance which individuals could afford and would cover their losses in time of disaster.

The subcommittee today released testimony received during its hearings.

"We need a program that can be triggered into action as soon after the disaster occurs as is physically and administratively possible," CLAUSEN said.

CLAUSEN said he believed any study proposed by Congress should proceed in the following general direction:

Ask the insurance industry to advise the Congress whether it can or cannot specifically provide adequate insurance underwriting to meet the problem, either by individual companies, through re-insurance or risk-pooling concepts?

If not, can an arrangement similar to the FHA underwriting Government industry cooperative agreement be developed?

Is a subsidy arrangement, containing adequately defined insurable limits a possibility—providing the administration of the program supplements and does not conflict with reasonable insurance program objectives?

The Red Cross, Salvation Army, Office of Emergency Planning, churches of all denominations and the many voluntary relief agencies should be asked to provide advice and counsel to the agency conducting the study, thereby providing the Congress with the invaluable benefits gained through years of disaster relief experience.

Adequate flood plain zoning must be an integral part of the program until such time as adequate flood protective works can be built.

Mr. CRAMER. This is one of the areas which such an ad hoc committee could study and come up with recommendations with regard to disaster relief in all of these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the session I introduced a bill requesting the Congress to establish such a commission and study the whole problem of disaster insurance and the relationship of the Federal Government, State governments, and local governments, with the insurance industry. Some months later the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] filed a bill identical to mine. Such a bill has passed the Senate. The measure was on our calendar a week ago Monday, the day on which we had 22 quorum and rollcalls. I believe it is known as Senate 408. If there is any possibility of taking that bill up this session, that proposal would be available for us to approach this serious and timely subject.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. That is another indication of the importance of the subject to many Members of the Congress. It is obviously urgent as a result of the floods that have taken place and the damage which has resulted throughout much of the South, including Florida and Louisiana, as examples.

Mr. Charman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] 7 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of my colleagues in debate on the floor of the House in relation to a bill which does not come from a committee of which I am a member. But I think it is necessary to do so because one of the projects in the bill directly affects both the responsibility and the position of a committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Appropriations.

The project involved that requires the attention of all of us who serve as Members of the House, and the manner in which that project appears in the bill, is the Trinity River project in Texas.

As I understand it, that is a project which approaches $1 billion in its scope. We are talking about the authorization of two parts of that project. The parts are quite similar in the amount of money involved. One-half billion dollars relates to water conservation, recreation, and flood control. That part, as I understand it, has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The other part, another one-half billion dollars, relates to navigation, a 12-foot canal, 150 feet wide, running for 300 or 400 miles across the State of Texas.

That part, as I also understand, does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has said that that part ought to be restudied and ought to be reevaluated, and the criteria upon which that reevaluation is made should be in terms of having it brought up to date before it ought to be considered for authorization. That part, as I also understand it, has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity on the basis of the figures which have been set forth by the Bureau of the Budget.

On page 85 appears an authorization for this $1 billion project of only $83 million.

But the language specifically says "including navigation." In other words, we are asked to partially authorize the part which has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the part which, under existing criteria, has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity.

Earlier today, if I recall correctly—and perhaps some corrections will be made by members of the committee—the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] referred to 12 new projects which have been sent up since this bill was reported, and earlier in the general debate someone referred to another project, I believe the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman in charge of floor debate suggested that there would probably be another omnibus bill next year.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee and particularly of the Subcommittee on Public Works, which has cognizance over the funding of projects of this kind, I cannot help being concerned over the manner in which this is being handled. This is a piecemeal authorization of a huge project, part of which does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and which has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1. I cannot help being concerned over the argument that we should authorize a part of it now so that the highway officials in the State of Texas will know that they can go ahead on the basis of it.

In other words, the foot will be in the door and every member of this committee will be considered as being committed, and the Appropriations Committee will be considered as being committed for not the $83 million which appears in this bill but for the billion dollars we are talking about for this project.

The Bureau of the Budget has said that there can be a restudy and a reevaluation within a period of 6 months. If that is true, I believe this Congress owes it to itself and the Members of the House owe to the integrity of our Appropriations Committee to await the results of that kind of a restudy and reevaluation. If it can be done in 6 months, as the Bureau of the Budget says, the results of that restudy will be before the second session of the 89th Congress so that, if there is an omnibus bill, as twice has been indicated today, it could be included as an authorization at that time.

It appears to me that we can do great harm to the confidence of the American people. We can do great harm to the confidence of the people in us and great harm to the confidence of the Members of the House and of the American people in the Committee on Public Works, the authorizing committee, if we proceed with this kind of a piecemeal authorization, in the light of the questions which have been raised both in the executive and legislative branches.

If I am wrong in these figures or if I am wrong in asserting that the Bureau of the Budget has said this ought to be reevaluated and restudied and that they do not approve of authorizing it at this time, we should have some clarification now. If I am correct, I believe this project ought to be deferred until the omnibus bill for next year.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman on his position. He is taking the same position that I took before the committee. I raised the same points he has raised and the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army raised. I offered an amendment to strike the navigational features from that portion of the authorization, setting forth the same objections and the same reasons the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has stated.

However, we were not successful in that effort. We did achieve an element of success. We had written into the authorization a provision for a restudy. We further obtained a concession that up-to-date or present criteria would be used in the restudy, including an adequate rate of interest together with the usual 50-year amortization or lifetime period.

In addition to that, the authorization, while it does in effect give blanket authorization to the entire project, only gives a monetary authorization in the sum of $83 million. That means the committee and the Congress will have to come back and take another look at this project after the restudy and before further monetary authorizations are made. So, while we did not accomplish the purposes set forth and overcome the objections raised by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army, we did in great measure strengthen the original proposal. We did accomplish that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio feels at least in the eyes of the people from the State of Texas that Congress is not committed and the hands of the members of the Committee on Appropriations are tied as far as being sure that we get the kind of a restudy and reevaluation we are talking about.

Mr. HARSHA. I think we will certainly get a restudy and certainly the legislative history is clear enough so that we will get a restudy based on current criteria. I am not fooling you or anybody else. We have authorized the project.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me set the record straight.

One of the really impressive things about this Trinity River program is the number of Americans it will serve.

The amount of money involved would not be considered too great when representing a total package for the development of the waters over the next 15 or 20 years in an entire State of our Union.

And yet, the Trinity River Basin, for which this project will do just that, contains more people than any one of 32 States in our Nation. The people who will benefit by this project amount to more than 3 percent of the Nation's total population.

Certainly we are not doing too much for them by comparison to projects for the rest of the country in development of water resources.

According to the projection made before our committee by Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, the Chief of Engineers for Civil Works if we assume that this project could be completed in 10 annual installments, we would be devoting approximately 2 percent of the Federal expenditures on water resources development. And yet this amount would be serving more than 3 percent of the population.

Today the Fort Worth and Dallas metropolitan area is the largest single concentration of people anywhere in the country not served by a navigable waterway.

So, as a matter of justice and fairness, it seems to me that this project is amply justified on the basis of the great part of Americans that it will serve and by the careful planning and cooperation which has gone into it.

Mr. WRIGHT. 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.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interest expressed by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], but there are certain factual inaccuracies contained in his summation of the Trinity River project.

It is not, as he indicated, a "billion-dollar project." At least it does not involve $1 billion in Federal expenditures. The only way we could refer to it accurately as a billion-dollar project would be by taking into account all of the moneys which have been expended and pledged by State and local and private sources to the completion of this vital program.

The best estimate available on the total Federal cost of the entire comprehensive program is approximately $737 million. This would extend over a period of at least 10 years in the completion of 14 flood control and multiple-purpose projects, as well as the navigation canal. The U.S. Corps of Engineers' estimate of $515 million for the navigation canal includes a 25-percent contingency fund safety factor which has been added to the cost estimates.

No comprehensive program of this type that has ever come before the Congress has enjoyed such a magnificent degree of willing local financial participation. More than $500 million in totally non-Federal funds either have been spent or will be spent on this total development program.

Our entire committee, I am sure, was greatly impressed by the intelligence and spirit of the large delegation from Texas which appeared before us in behalf of this Trinity River project.

It was the largest group to come before the committee in behalf of any program we had under consideration. The testimony given by the group was factual and intelligent and extremely well presented.

But the main thing this delegation demonstrated was the complete unanimity of support, public and private, for this project. There were in that group 62 mayors and 15 county judges, as well as the civic and industrial leaders of Texas.

They filed with the committee copies of official resolutions adopted by the local governing bodies pledging their local financial and moral cooperation in every phase of this activity.

The people living in the Trinity River Basin have indeed put their money where their mouth is. They already have spent $269 million of local money in the development of this river basin and have

pledged additional amounts totaling $256 million more.

In other words, the local non-Federal interests, are putting up a total of more than half a billion dollars to match the Federal Government's work in connection with this project. They have completely demonstrated their good faith.

On the basis of this factor alone, it seems to me that this project deserves our support.

The committee very carefully considered the Trinity River project and determined that it is fully justified on the basis of a realistic benefits-cost ratio.

The economic justification of the project was quite evident to those of us who listened attentively to the testimony.

We in the committee feel that the Corps of Engineers projection of the usage of the navigation canal is extremely conservative and that it actually will produce an enormous volume of shipping, a great deal more, in fact, than would be necessary to produce a favorable benefits-cost ratio.

The history of the traffic projections by the Corps of Engineers would seem to bear this out.

On the upper Mississippi, the Engineers projected anticipated tonnage of only 9 million tons. By 1963, the actual tonnage had reached 31 million, or 344 percent of the anticipated volume.

On the Illinois Waterway, the official projection was for only 7.5 million tons. Actually, tonnage in 1963 was 23.6 million—three times as much.

The Ohio River, estimated by the Corps of Engineers at 9 million tons annually, reached 88 million tons in 1963, or 973 percent of the estimate.

More in point, the Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal between New Orleans and Corpus Christi exceeded the 7-million-ton estimate by seven times, reaching approximately 50 million tons in 1963.

This Trinity Canal will connect with the Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal. The Bureau of the Budget stated that it was greatly impressed by the growth of the area. The canal will bring still greater industrialization and growth, and will pay for itself several times over.

The Bureau of the Budget made what the committee regarded as a most significant statement, when it said:

> More recent information on the growth of industry and freight traffic in the area suggests significant changes in the benefits originally assigned to the project. We have been impressed by the industrial growth in this region which has occurred since 1958.

As set forth in this bill, there are ample safeguards and continuing opportunities for congressional review, as explained by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA]. It is quite true that we are authorizing the project exactly as recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

On any project of this scope and duration, however, the requirement of appropriations to carry out the work gives to Congress a continuing review.

The Public Works Committee, after carefully considering all sides and hearing all testimony in connection with the Trinity River project, has decided clearly that it is economically justified.

The divsion engineer assigned to it a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.6 to 1. The Chief of Engineers recommended the project. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors also recommended the project.

It has been further recommended by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in all by a total of 18 official State and Federal agencies of government.

Interestingly, these recommendations were based on very low tonnage projections for shipments of grain and other commodities by way of the navigation canal.

The basic year used in the Corps of Engineers study was 1958—the last year of a scorching 7-year drought in the Southwest. Obviously, the amount of grain being grown in that year was far below normal.

Yet, even so, the figures came out favorably.

The records show that the actual shipment of grain today which would go by the waterway is already more than three times as much as was anticipated by this time in the use of the 1958 figures which formed the basis of the favorable report of the study.

To put it another way, shipments available for the barge canal are already greater than the Corps of Engineers projection anticipated for the year 2010.

The committee has on file affidavits from commercial shippers who state the volumes available which they would ship by the canal if it were complete now. In some cases these totals amount to 10 times as much as was credited in the favorable Corps of Engineers study.

So, on the basis of these facts and on the basis of the demonstrated local enthusiasm and cooperation, the committee felt strongly that this project is well-justified economically and deserves our support.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Public Works, I want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], for their diligent and outstanding efforts in bringing this omnibus bill to the floor. It has been 3 years since a rivers and harbors beach erosion, flood control and water supply proposal has come to the House and I think these gentlemen are to be commended for their stated policy that in the future an omnibus bill will come up each year. This will insure that projects that have been studied closely by the Corps of Engineers and recommended favorably by Government departments will be acted upon without undue legislative delay.

The actions of the Corps of Engineers, and of course of this committee, in their deliberations in authorizing the Staten Island hurricane protection and beach erosion control will insure that this rapidly expanding community does not suffer the critical damage and heartbreaking effects that have always accompanied the seasonal hurricane assaults on the northeastern coast.

The action of the committee also in approving the East Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay shore erosion and hurricane protection will not only assist this community, which has already poured 11 million cubic yards of fill on this shoreline, but will insure thousands of small craft owners a hurricane seawall across the entrance to Jamaica Bay to insure that their boats will have a protected haven from hurricanes and other heavy storms.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the report it is stated that a long period of time has been required from a survey investigation to the final submission of a report to Congress. The committee report stated that the average time for this action has been estimated at something in excess of 10 years. I am happy to note that the two projects on Staten Island and East Rockaway have been studied and authorized within a 2½-year period. This could not have been done had not the Corps of Engineers and the members of this committee been so cooperative in expending their time and energy throughout the hearings to assist in the authorizations of these vital projects.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now under consideration—the rivers and harbors flood control bill. First, I want to commend the members of the House Public Works Committee on its comprehensive and detailed report on this measure. I know the members labored long—at least 5 weeks of House hearings were held in addition to Senate hearings and many of the 144 projects provided for in this measure had separate days of hearings.

It is of extreme interest to me that the farsighted members of the House Public Works Committee saw fit to include in this legislation provisions to meet the future water supply needs of our northeastern seaboard.

We cannot be indifferent to the warning signals we have received via drought and from which our northeastern seaboard has not recovered. Those of us who represent communities suffering from shortage of water this year are understandably apprehensive about our Nation's dwindling water supply and the plans set forth in title I of this act provide for a good first step in the right direction.

In addition, I want to make note of the fact that it is gratifying to me that two projects for my congressional district have been favorably recommended for consideration.

For the benefit of the economy and easy navigation of Providence River, local authorities of the capital city of my State have long been urging the deepening of the channel to the port of Providence itself. We have been experiencing a serious navigation problem in this area, as many large vessels serving the industries on the river and the harbor have been subjected to tidal delays and serious restrictions on loading. Additionally, large tankers now cannot enter the channel and this in itself seriously affects the economy of what

was once a thriving port. The deepening of the river and enlarging of the harbor will add a stimulus to our State's economy at a time when existing industry needs it and when the port of Providence needs new industry. This project is of deep concern to me for its subsequent benefits to my State and I urge its retention in this measure which I hope will be passed with an overwhelming vote.

The second project in the measure, which is also of deep concern to me, is the restoration of Cliff Walk at Newport, R.I., where beach erosion has caused this historic walk to be impassable. Its restoration, well in line with the administration's beautification recommendations, will allow our present and future generations—as our past generations have done—to view the Narragansett Bay area, the scenic beauty of which far exceeds one's expectations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I am especially interested in the proposal contained in title I to direct an overall survey of the water needs of the northeastern part of the country, which is now suffering from its fourth consecutive year of bruising drought. This title would direct the Army Engineers to survey the possibilities of establishing some sort of water "grid" within this northeast area, so that available water supplies could be more easily diverted from one area into other areas where the need happened at the moment to be greater. This is what is done at the moment in the case of electric power. Whether the same concept can be entirely successfully applied to water I do not know, but I do think it makes sense for us to take a look at it and see whether it does.

I am interested in this overall idea in particular because it applies to a situation which has existed for some years in my own district, and which may exist in other areas of the country as well. Some 30 years ago as the result of a damaging 1935 flash flood in New York State the Army Engineers proposed the construction of some seven flood-control dams to be built on tributaries of the north branch of the Susquehanna River for the purpose of impounding and holding back any future flood waters of this kind. Congress authorized their construction, and two of these dams were soon constructed. But funds for the remaining five were never appropriated, largely because of protests from upstream residents whose valuable farmland, homes, and even villages would be destroyed by the dams in question. No repetition of the 1935 flood has ever occurred in the intervening years, partly because of the protection afforded not only by the two dams which have been built but also because of flood walls and other works constructed in the downstream area. Yet the fight between the downstream people and the upstream people—who are my constituents—has gone on with considerable intensity. In fact only this year the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] and I both had to fight hard to head off a renewed effort to get the appropriation of construction funds begun for two of these five unconstructed dams. We sold our case to the Appropriations Committee of the House, though we only partly sold it to the other body. But both of us are hopeful that the conference committee will accept the point of view of the House committee on this issue and defer any construction of these costly unbudgeted dams for yet another year.

Some 5 years ago, however, in an effort to try to be constructive on this issue, I proposed in an address to the Binghamton, N.Y., Rotary Club in September 1960, that there might be a way to deal with any possible flood waters along the Susquehanna that might menace the city of Binghamton without requiring the expropriation of valuable upstream farmland, and the destruction of homes and villages which the Army Engineers' proposal would entail. I pointed out that the Delaware River Basin, just to the east of the Susquehanna Basin, already included two very large reservoir dams, for the purpose of supplying water for the city of New York, one of these at Cannonsville, and one at Downsville. In fact in the areas of the Cannonsville Dam the Susquehanna and the Delaware Rivers are only about 20 miles apart. My suggestion was that instead of building costly upstream dams, that would have at the best very limited usefulness, we should construct a tunnel between the two river basins, and divert any excess waters from the Susquehanna in time of high water or potential flood into the Delaware River and its reservoirs.

The idea was regarded as rather fantastic at the time. But this is precisely what is now being proposed here in title I. And the proposal is even more relevant than ever, because of course the city of New York is short of water, and the city of Philadelphia also wants more water in the Delaware too to keep the salt water line below her boundaries.

I do not know just how feasible my idea is. But at least now it can be fully explored, and I am very hopeful that when the survey is completed we can indeed come up with something that will meet the needs of the people of the Binghamton area without causing the destruction that the 30-year-old dam program of the Army Engineers would certainly do.

In this connection, however, Mr. Chairman, I do support very strongly the suggestion that the conduct of this survey should not be turned over to the Army Engineers. It should be given instead to the Water Resources Council, under the control of the Department of the Interior. In my own case, for example, it would be most unlikely that the Army Engineers, investigating my proposal for diverting water from the Susquehanna to the Delaware, would be likely to end up rejecting their own original big dam project. I have found over the years that when it comes to water matters the Army Engineers have no flexibility or imagination. They have only one approach: dams, dams, and more big dams. We certainly do need fresh thinking if the full value of the very unusual studies proposed in title I is to be achieved. Hence I strongly support the change.

One final word, Mr. Chairman. Some fear has been expressed within the Finger Lakes area which I also have the honor to represent, that the construction of such a water grid system might mean that the waters of the Finger Lakes might be tapped to meet the needs of New York City. I am quite confident that this would never be the case. In any case this is only a study. We have pressing water needs enough within our own territory. Besides that, we certainly would not want to destroy one of the great recreational assets of our State and indeed of the entire country for the benefit of just one city. But in any event, Mr. Chairman, I want to serve notice now that I would strongly and vigorously resist any such proposal to tap the water resources of the Finger Lakes for the benefit of any area except the Finger Lakes area itself. It would be completely unwarranted.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, this has been a disastrous year for thousands of Kansans who have experienced great personal and property losses because of floods. The economic impact upon my State has been heavy. Early in the spring, floods in the Walnut River Basin caused approximately $5 to $6 million in damages. In June, rampaging floodwaters of the Arkansas River caused over $20 million damages in Kansas and Colorado. Untold damages also have resulted from flash floods on creeks and other smaller tributaries in Kansas.

But Kansas citizens also know the serious consequences of the prolonged cycles of drought which historically have plagued mankind.

These experiences have brought us to recognize the importance of planning and developing effective flood control measures and at the same time implementing programs to conserve, develop, and fully utilize our precious water resources.

Over $73 million in new authorizations are included in this bill, S. 2300, for flood control projects in the State of Kansas. In addition, this legislation also authorizes several important studies by the Corps of Engineers.

Section 207, title II, of this bill provides for broadening an on-going study of the Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Okla., to include navigation as a purpose and to include the reach between Hutchinson and Great Bend, Kans., which are not covered by the outstanding authorities under which such studies are being made.

The estimated cost of the additional studies that would be made, assuming that a complete survey scope investigation might be necessary, is $387,000 and about 6 years will be required to submit a report to Congress. Appropriations would be divided over the 6-year study period.

There is strong support at local, State, and regional levels for a comprehensive multipurpose study, including navigation, of the Arkansas River and tributaries from the headwaters of the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Tulsa, Okla. Such a study also would encompass the needs for flood control, water

supply, water quality control, recreation, and other beneficial uses of the water resources.

I have received strong statements of support from the Governor of Kansas, the Mid-Arkansas River Basin Water Study Committee and its chairman, Don Pray, of Wichita, the city of Wichita, city of Hutchinson, Kans., the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Kansas, the Kaw Dam and Reservoir Development Association, Inc., and many private citizens.

The interest in determining the feasibility of extension of navigation stems from several significant factors. Navigation is now a reality to Kansas City and Omaha on the Missouri River. By 1970 navigation will be an accomplished fact to Catoosa, a suburb of Tulsa, Okla. Extension of navigation to Wichita and beyond would be a logical next step if this investigation determines it to be feasible and within economic reason.

Admittedly it is difficult to envision in 1965 barges or other large vessels moving down a navigable channel of the Arkansas River from Wichita to Tulsa. However, we would be remiss in our responsibilities to future generations if we failed to explore every possibility of developing, to the fullest extent possible, every resource for the economic development of this area and the Nation.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, the legislation that we consider here today—S. 2300, the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood protection bill—is absolutely essential to the growth, safety, and continued expansion of our common country.

The bill provides America's cities, towns, and rural areas critically needed protection against the threat and reality of floods—floods that in recent times have racked almost every section of the Nation, causing billions of dollars in destruction, leaving thousands of families homeless, and inflicting incalculable human misery and suffering.

This legislation will improve and increase the Nation's water supply at a time when the severe, growing shortage of pure water is a cause for national alarm.

The bill will further strengthen the great network of rivers and harbors that means so very much to our national economy and to our international trade program.

Finally, this legislation will combat the ever-present menace of erosion; it will increase the use of hydroelectric power and it will create new recreational areas in a nation that is fast outgrowing existing facilities for outdoor recreation, such as fishing, boating, swimming, and camping.

Let me briefly discuss the benefits of just one of the programs authorized in this legislation. I refer to the Athens local flood protection projects for my 10th District of Ohio.

This project would prevent land and property damages from smaller floods that have plagued Athens and Ohio University for so many years; it would substantially reduce damages from larger floods, such as those that caused nearly $2 million in destruction to the Athens area in 1963–64.

Importantly, the flood protection project would open up almost 500 acres of undeveloped land in the Athens flood plain for utilization by Ohio University and private industry. Specifically, it would protect 235 acres on which the university has invested $30 million in physical improvements, and it would permit immediately additional construction of $41 million by Ohio University on land that is now undeveloped.

The Athens project also would result in average annual benefits of $460,000 in increased property values and local tax revenues; improved water quality, recreation, tourism, and, of course, in flood protection.

I would be remiss if I did not commend the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Flood Control for the tremendous work it has done in putting this legislation together. I particularly commend the distinguished chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee [Mr. JONES] for his valuable assistance in my efforts to secure authorization of the Athens local flood protection plan. The people of my area had been striving for 24 long and frustrating years to obtain this project. I am delighted that I was able to bring it to the point where success depends now only on the affirmative vote of this Congress.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the ranking minority member, my colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and all their able colleagues on the fine work they have done in presenting this bill to the House. Long hearings and careful study of the projects in the public works omnibus authorization bill have produced this important bill, which is vital to the national interest.

I would like to comment on two projects in the bill, which are in my home district, Duval County, Fla.

One is the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of the Budget approved project to deepen the Jacksonville Harbor from 34 to 38 feet. In recent years millions of dollars have been spent by local interests on improving the port which serves as an important port of entry from the Atlantic Ocean and joins with the St. Johns River to serve a wide area for commerce in the South. The Jacksonville Port Authority, led by a distinguished group of local citizens, has been established and the proposed deepening of the Jacksonville Harbor is needed in line with the authority's goals to improve shipping and commerce and to handle the great amount of traffic which has been generated.

The Jacksonville Harbor is destined to play an even more important role in the waterway traffic of the Nation. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which will link the oil-producing States of the West to the oil-consuming States of the East for the benefit of millions of Americans and the national security, is now being constructed at an adequate pace. The completion of the canal will mean even more traffic by water between the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The discovery of new phosphate deposits in northeast Florida increases the need for the harbor improvements, and one large international company has already spent very substantial sums to provide for a shipping area, including a huge dock, to handle the increased phosphate shipments.

The proposed project would deepen the harbor to the Jacksonville municipal docks and terminals. I am pushing for further deepening nearer the center of Jacksonville, which has the support of local interests, and I am hopeful in the near future that this will gain approval by the Corps of Engineers.

The other Duval County project included in this bill is a 10-year program, approved by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of the Budget, for beach erosion control along the shoreline of the county. The local sponsor, the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, has agreed to meet the non-Federal cost of the project, which will involve some $3.5 million over the 10 years.

This is a very important project for the shoreline of the county. During the last 3 years, storms and Hurricane Dora have battered the beach area, which includes a growing population of now over 20,000 persons. A program for beach nourishment is badly needed, and the Corps of Engineers have developed a plan of improvement which will help solve the beach erosion problem and protect valuable public and private buildings and developments along the shoreline. Included in the master plan is beach erosion control at the Mayport Naval Station, a key base from which carriers and destroyers are directed for worldwide duty.

Mr. Chairman, both the Jacksonville Harbor project and the beach erosion plan for Duval County are essential to the national interest. I am happy to support this bill.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House authorizes nearly $2 billion in public works, including flood control projects, water supply, water treatment, and similar purposes. It is my understanding that nearly 42 States reap in some degree the largess of this legislation. Yet Wyoming, for reasons long a puzzle to its citizens, is dealt a summary and resounding zero in the authorizations under this bill.

Recently the town of Mountain View in Uinta County suffered flood damage which will require expenditures well in excess of a quarter of a million dollars. The Smith Fork River will need riprapping for nearly a mile on both of its banks in order to stabilize the course and to make sure that there will not be repetition of this year's damage. Conservative estimates in excess of one-half million dollars tabbed the damage which was done to the parks and shorelines of the much-used Flaming Gorge Reservoir which is mainly in Wyoming and in a portion of Utah.

A disaster area designation this summer would have done much to assist

these Wyoming communities and interests that were so severely damaged. But in the direct proportion to the damage of Colorado and of areas in other parts of America, Wyoming's damage was, of course, minimal, but a ruined farm is just as ruined if you are a Wyoming farmer as your interest should you be one of many others similarly damaged in the larger States.

Still in all, when Wyoming's Governor made application to Director Ellington of the Office of Emergency Planning for a disaster designation for Wyoming, we in Wyoming were categorically refused assistance, and even refused a visit of OEP officials in order that our evidence for such a designation might be examined first-hand. Indeed as Wyoming's only Congressman, I know that I was not notified, not appraised, nor in anyway contacted by the Office of Emergency Planning regarding this designation. I am further informed that neither of Wyoming's representatives in the other body of Congress were informed or contacted upon this categorical refusal for flood aid to the people or the political subdivisions of Wyoming.

In addition, Wyoming now has a project called the Fontennelle Dam which has sprung a serious leak in it and has endangered life and property along the entire Green River Valley.

I am aware that this bill will pass with an overwhelming majority since some 42 States have an economic interest in its passage; I am also aware that a voice vote against it is somewhat a voice in the wilderness with no intention of being provincial but with the hope that I can attract attention to an inequity, I ought to vote against its passage today as a measure of protest against neglect and abuse which I feel has been dealt to my State in this legislation. It would seem to me that equity itself ought to dictate the consideration of every State in the Union when $2 billion is packaged in one omnibus bill for projects benefiting the citizens of this Nation.

I shall, however reluctantly, support this bill in the hope that Wyoming's days of such neglect in this regard and its days of being treated as something short of a colony or territory may soon be coming to an end.

I hope other Members of this Congress from those States benefiting from this bill may take notice and remember this action when big and beautiful Wyoming presents its projects in the years to come.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, the 1965 omnibus public works authorization bill.

This bill, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, would authorize construction of two projects of importance to many people in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, which I represent.

First, it would provide authorization for a dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Skunk River, about 5 miles north of the city of Ames. This project is needed for flood protection in the Skunk River Valley, which includes four counties in the district which I represent.

The Skunk River has caused extensive flood damage to crops and property in this area. In June 1947, for example, the river flooded about 78,000 acres, causing a total of $3,878,000 in damage.

This project was not included in S. 2300, as passed by the Senate on July 27, because the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was not able to transmit its recommendation to the Congress until August 12.

However, the House Committee on Public Works has included the Skunk River project in the bill under consideration today, and I am hopeful that this project will remain in the version of S. 2300 that is finally passed by the Congress.

Second, this bill contains authorization for construction of a flood control project at Marshalltown, Iowa, which is needed to protect portions of the city against high waters on the Iowa River and Linn Creek.

This project is also vitally needed, since flooding at Marshalltown has been persistent and costly. Since June 1947, for example, six major floods have hit Marshalltown, either from the Iowa River or Linn Creek, causing a total of more than $750,000 in property damage to the community. This total excludes an estimated $55,000 in damage caused this spring by flood waters that swept through Marshalltown, forcing residents to resort to emergency measures to keep the high waters at least partly under control.

The Marshalltown project is included in the Senate version of S. 2300. In addition, the Senate voted to provide a $50,000 appropriation for planning work on the Marshalltown project when it voted approval August 23 of H.R. 9220, the omnibus public works appropriations bill.

The House of Representatives, of course, was unable to appropriate any funds for the Marshalltown project when it passed H.R. 9220 on June 22, since the project was not authorized at that time.

However, the House and Senate conferees have not yet met to resolve the differences in the two versions of H.R 9220. If the House approves the bill before it today, including authorization for the Marshalltown project, it will be possible to include the $50,000 in planning funds in the final version of the public works appropriations bill.

Prompt and favorable action by the Congress is needed if the Skunk River and Marshalltown projects are to proceed without delay, and I therefore urge the House to pass the authorization bill under consideration today.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, S. 2300.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but be provoked when I hear this bill referred to as pork barrel legislation. The projects carried in this and prior bills on the same subject have authorized great projects which have directly benefited our own citizens. The bill before us today provides for flood control, navigation projects, hurricane protection, and so forth.

This bill directly affects my own congressional district. It authorizes a project to provide hurricane protection in Jamaica Bay, N.Y., which borders the entire southern portion of my district.

Jamaica Bay is 8 miles long, 4 miles wide, and covers an area of approximately 26 square miles. Communities in my district which border on the bay are Howard Beach, Rosedale—reached by Hook Creek—and the John F. Kennedy International Airport—a veritable city unto itself.

Howard Beach, including Hamilton Beach, is experiencing a tremendous and rapid growth. The population figure of 13,000 given in the Engineers' report is based on the 1960 census which is no longer realistic—entire communities have sprung up within the boundaries of Howard Beach since 1960. Howard Beach is constantly under the threat of flooding in the shore area from any abnormally high tides.

Rosedale is not physically on Jamaica Bay as is Howard Beach, but Hook Creek is the means by which flooding, at times up to 3 feet, comes to this community.

The John F. Kennedy International Airport, entirely within my congressional district, occupies approximately 4,900 acres of land bordering on Jamaica Bay between Bergen Basin and head of bay. The airport continues to expand as marshland is filled in for runway extensions, and so forth. Flooding from severe storms causes disruption to flight activities. As this airport expands its activities, there is an increase in the demand for gasoline and other supplies, much of which reaches the airport by water transportation, using the navigation channels in Jamaica Bay.

If we can secure hurricane protection, I can see untold benefits accruing to untold numbers of people. Jamaica Bay has the potential for becoming a great recreation and commercial area. With adequate protection, we may look forward to a tremendous increase in boating, swimming, fishing, and other water-related activities. These activities will, of course, bring demands for business facilities to supply the needs of these interests, and so it goes with demand and supply. Business brings profits and profits are taxed and income flows to the Treasury. In Queens County we seek additional business investment—I know that this project will be another incentive for such investment.

I have referred to the project which directly affects the Seventh Congressional District of New York. I am sure that the other projects in this bill are just as vital to other areas as the Jamaica Bay project is to my district.

I urge the passage of S. 2300.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to comment upon the importance of title I of S. 2300. Title I authorizes the preparation of a regional plan for meeting the future water needs of the northeastern seaboard. Title I authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army through the Chief of Engineers "to prepare a plan to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States." The plan, according to title I, would provide for a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between major river basins, and purification plants.

Significantly title I recognizes that the Federal Government has an obligation to develop a national policy in the vitally important area of water resources. The report of the Committee on Public Works points out that State and even interstate arrangements are no longer adequate to meet the water needs of the great megalopolis of the northeastern seaboard. The committee concludes:

> Now we face a situation that requires collective action at a still higher level—the level of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, while I note the foresight contained in title I, I do not think that the proposed survey for the Northeast will be sufficient to meet the great water supply problems of that area. At present there is a multiplicity of jurisdictions and policies concerning water resources. Although the need for Federal coordination is recognized, there is no overall national water policy. Of course, the plan envisioned in title I will be helpful and could make a major contribution to an overall policy, but it is not a substitute for an overall policy.

The water shortage crisis in the Northeast makes clear the need to establish a national policy and a uniform Federal standard governing the use of all water resources constitutionally subject to Federal supervision.

I have introduced the Federal Water Commission Act of 1965, H.R. 10244, to accomplish this through a Federal Water Commission. This bill vests authority to enforce Federal standards in an independent regulatory agency comparable to the Federal Power Commission.

A key provision in the measure permits the Commission to suspend the application of the Federal water use and water pollution law if it finds that regional, State, or local regulations meet Federal standards. Any such action by the Commission would be reviewed after the elapse of 5 years in order to assure continuous coordination in the development and use of Federal water resources.

Other provisions of my proposed Federal Water Commission Act would—

Establish a Federal Water Commission of 5 members appointed by the President to develop and administer and enforce an integrated national policy of water use and water pollution control;

Provide Federal licensing procedures governing the withdrawal and pollution of all interstate, navigable, and coastal waters where existing laws fall below Federal standards;

Set a Federal standard of beneficial use applicable to all public and private activities which draw on water under Federal jurisdiction or result in their pollution;

Specifically protect all existing water rights as long as they are not injurious, and exempt all withdrawals of water by individual householders for normal domestic use;

Provide the Commission with special powers to cope with acute water shortages and emergencies; and

Delete a provision in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 which would prohibit the Delaware River Basin Commission from cooperating effectively with the proposed Hudson River Basin Commission to increase New York City's water supplies.

Although title I of S. 2300 provides for a constructive plan, Congress has failed to face the hard fact that we must have an integrated national policy of water conservation, water development, and water pollution control. We are developing a national electric power grid. Water is obviously a scarcer resource and far more vulnerable to the caprices of nature. The establishment of a Federal Water Commission will result in the allocation of water resources to secure an ample, constant water supply for all citizens of the United States.

Title I of S. 2300 is a step in the direction of establishing a national water policy, but I urge that there be hearings as soon as possible on H.R. 10244.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important features of S. 2300, the omnibus public works bill, is title I of the bill, which calls for the Federal Government to take the lead in making an intensive study of how to meet the future water supply needs of the Nation's northeastern seaboard and to prepare a regional plan for meeting these needs, including a system of major reservoirs, aqueducts between major river basins, and purification plants.

I am delighted that under this bill the principle is recognized that the Federal Government must accept substantial responsibility in meeting the water shortage problems of the northeastern area. At the same time, I am glad that the bill was amended to assure that the study will be carried on in cooperation with all agencies concerned: Federal, State, and local; and that all procedures will be consistent with the Water Resources Planning Act passed at this session—and which I was glad to support, both in the Interior Committee and on the floor of the House.

The New York City water shortage is part of a regional problem. To a certain extent, the needs of New York City are in competition with the needs of other nearby cities and suburban areas, and the various conflicting claims must be resolved by Federal and interstate action. At the same time, however, the interests of the entire region can be furthered by Federal study, planning, and action in this area.

The bill leaves open the possibility that the Federal Government will actually undertake to construct the reservoirs, aqueducts, and purification plants in question, with provision for appropriate financial participation by the States and localities. However, each such project would have to be approved by a future act of Congress.

While the bill before us can have no immediate effect on the current water shortage, it represents needed action in the direction of long-range and permanent solutions.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, this body is today being asked to authorize almost $2 billion worth of public works projects. Most of these projects are being strongly supported by local interests in the areas involved and by Members of Congress from the regions involved. However, my attention is drawn to one of the most expensive projects—the proposed power development on the St. John River in Maine—which does not have this overwhelming local support. Opponents of the St. John project include some Congressmen from the New England region, the New England Council, and the electric companies of New England.

Mr. Speaker, where there is smoke I am one who believes that a search for fire is necessary and in the case of this project that fire is there. On examination, the project turns out not to be flood control, not to be navigation, not to be area development but to be almost pure power. The Department of the Interior—which is not known for undervaluing the benefits from its proposals—claims less than 5 percent of the benefits from sources other than power. So we have here a power project, and any power project in New England is important to the people of Pennsylvania because coal—one of our State's major resources and sources of livelihood—represents the fuel supply for roughly 60 percent of the power used in New England. This hydroelectric project will supplant both coal and nuclear facilities for the part of New England's future powerload which it will fill.

Replacing coal with hydroelectric power—by committing $300 million of tax money—is something which the Pennsylvania delegation should wish to examine with considerable care. If hydropower is really cheaper than other sources in New England that is one thing, but it is clear from the testimony of witnesses before the Public Works Committee that this is not the case. In the committee hearings various cost estimates were given for alternative power sources. One fact stands out in that discussion—there are cheaper ways to produce equivalent quantities of power. Coal should be allowed to compete for the privilege of serving New England's expanding power loads. Even the Federal Power Commission in its formal comments on this project seems to be excluding the coal industry from consideration. The FPC admitted that steamplants, nuclear plants and pumped storage "were found to be capable of producing power at lower cost than the proposed Passamaquoddy-Dickey-Lincoln School project." The FPC went on to say that "such comparisons with alternatives should not be governing" because Federal financing was not anticipated for the other power sources.

Mr. Chairman, while the FPC report was aimed at the combination of Passamaquoddy and St. John, the attitude reflected in that letter seems to permeate the executive branch. Who says that "comparisons with alternatives should not be governing"? Who says that we should be asked to spend $300 million for hydro, when coal fired steamplants are cheaper? Who says we should spend these funds when private utilities can and will do the job cheaper and pay taxes to boot? Who says that the people of the 21st District of Pennsylvania should pay the costs of hydro in New England when steam is cheaper? Mr. Chairman, I say, "no."

I would like to be able to provide great detail on the costs of this project and the relative costs of other projects on the basis of information provided by the Department of the Interior—but no such details exist. We have before us a project which was conceived and designed as a part of another project—a child yanked from its mother with no indication of whether it can stand on its own feet. The Corps of Engineers—whose technical abilities I admire greatly—has advised that it does not know whether there is market for this power.

It has been advised by Interior that there is. Fine, so long as Interior knows whereof it speaks. It does not. There is a market says Interior. But that agency, by its own testimony, has not talked to power companies, has not talked to cooperatives, and has not talked to municipalities to determine whether or not anybody wants the power at prices that will repay the costs of the project even over the 100 years over which payments will be stretched at the artificially low interest rate of 3⅛ percent. The power from this project has to be sold somewhere. It can not all be sold in Maine—in fact, some 96 percent of the output will have to be sold outside of the area in which it is to be produced. So, we are told that if we authorize this project we are also, in effect, authorizing some $70 million worth of transmission lines, but nobody knows where these lines will go nor what they will carry nor to whom.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I concur with my colleague from Pennsylvania—a member of the Public Works Committee—who in his individual views said:

There are many unanswered questions on this particular project. I am not sure that we are ever going to get the answers to them. But I am sure that until we make a try at getting the information that we do not now have, we should not support any requests for authorization of this project.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, under the rule the bill and the committee substitute now in the bill will be read by titles instead of by sections. The Clerk will now read by titles the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to prepare a plan to meet the long-range water needs of the Northeastern United States. This plan shall provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plan shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

Mr. CRAMER (interrupting the reading of the title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF ALABAMA

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, strike out the sentence which begins on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States."

On page 37, line 11, delete "shall" and substitute in lieu thereof "may".

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I discussed earlier in the debate on the pending proposal. What this seeks to do is to allay the apprehensions of some people that the Water Resources Planning Act would be violated by title I. This is intended to make clear that the Water Resources Planning Act will be honored in making presentations and representations in any plans that may be submitted by the Corps of Engineers for the consideration of the Congress.

The second amendment is on page 37 and provides for deletion of the word "shall" and places in lieu thereof the word "may".

This is to give ample assurances that the Water Resources Planning Act is further recognized as being the strong arm of water resources development.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendments that the gentleman has proposed. Without repeating what was discussed in the general debate, and the questions I asked the gentleman relating to these amendments which I understood would be offered, I trust the gentleman agrees now, as I said then, that these amendments, of course, relate to the Water Resources Planning Act and will guarantee—plus section 203 in the bill—that the States, the local agencies—and I am now referring to the Water Resources Planning Act—the States, localities, private enterprise, in cooperation with all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises and others concerned, with the conservation, development, and utilization of water, will be consulted regarding any such plan.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman. That is the purpose of the amendments, to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. CRAMER. And likewise, changing "shall" to "may" means that the corps will have greater flexibility in determining what will be the Federal responsibility in these different areas suggested in the authorizing language, including the area of water purification and transmission lines.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the aim I seek in the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I support the amendment. I think it will benefit this northeastern water study and plan proposal.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Alabama on the excellent job he has done in providing us with this Northeast water planning provision, particularly with respect to the amendments to bring into play the Water Resources Council. This is something that will be invaluable to communities such as my own, that are suffering under the severest kind of drought situation.

I would like to ask one question for the sake of the legislative record, if I may. That is, who is actually to do the planning work under this provision as amended? It is not 100 percent clear whether the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers will do this work or whether it is to be done in cooperation with all the agencies involved.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would have to be with all the agencies involved. I would like to inform the gentleman from New York that in the submission of a project there may be involved some 35 agencies and activities of the Federal Government. It was never the intention of the committee in writing title I to exclude the Council from participating in the promulgation of the plan. That was the suspicion that was raised, without, I am afraid, close examination of the existing law. But I repeat to the gentleman what I said earlier in the debate;

section 203 of the bill provides that the procedures adopted in the Flood Control Act of 1944 would be continued. Therefore it will assure to the Congress that the plans and programs would have to be submitted with comments from the various agencies of the States and other involved principals in the project.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, suppose there were disagreement between the Water Resources Council and, say, the Corps of Engineers on a particular point in these plans? Which agency is the coordinating agency?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The submission would be made by the Corps of Engineers, but it would have to contain the points of disagreement; and the Congress itself will resolve the disagreement. It does not mean by passing this title that there will not be problems which will always be inherent in any type of arrangement involving so many agencies. I sincerely hope that the Council members will use their good offices to bring about harmony in resolving disagreements when they arise.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows: Page 38, line 12:

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single- and multiple-purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Saint John River Basin

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

New England-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

Long Island Sound area

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

Hudson River Basin

The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

New York-Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighth-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

Neuse River Basin

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

Middle Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

Flint River Basin

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

Central and southern Florida basin

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

South Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000 and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be required as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as is required by paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

Ouachita River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in the House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

Red River Basin

The proviso in the paragraph under the center heading "Red River Basin" in the Act of December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 840, Public Law 88-253) relating to the Waurika project, Oklahoma, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein required for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir as described in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $418,000, whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of such a refuge.".

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

The project for Sandars, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

Gulf of Mexico

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

Rio Grande Basin

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

Arkansas River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

Missouri River Basin

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000 except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River.

The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85-500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

Ohio River Basin

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,* That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Red River of the north basin

The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimtaed increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944, (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report

of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

Great Lakes Basin

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

Little Colorado River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

Gila River Basin

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenadtions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

Eel River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

Sacramento River Basin

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

San Francisco Bay Area

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

Whitewater River Basin

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

Santa Ana River Basin

The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

San Diego River Basin

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work done by such interests on such project after the date of enactment of this Act, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Columbia River Basin

The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

The project for acquisition of additional lands for waterfowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of the Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and 30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California,

Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

Boyer River, Iowa.

Keokuk, Iowa.

Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

Mount Vernon, Indiana.

Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

Hatchie River and tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Spoon River, Illinois.

Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Verdigris River, Kansas.

Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sanderson, Texas.

Abbeville, South Carolina.

All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes", approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA-41-443-eng-939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 211. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

SEC. 212. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 213. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

SEC. 214. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out "before November 1, 1956,".

SEC. 215. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army shall pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements, which are or which were totally situated or partially situated on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of such improvements, which have been or will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kansas, as determined by the Secretary, or by the United States District Court for the District of Kansas on which is conferred jurisdiction for this purpose. In no case shall the owner of such improvements receive dual compensation for any part of said improvements as a result of this section or otherwise. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 218. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

SEC. 219. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000".

SEC. 220. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 221. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Mr. JONES of Alabama (interrupting reading of title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the title be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, the gentleman from Alabama is not going to attempt to cut off debate or discussion of the amendments on this title through such a request, is he?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no, I do not intend to make any such request so long as there is a reasonable amount of time used in debating it. If there is a protracted discussion that is repetitious, then we would have to consider that approach.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alabama agrees, does he not, that if there is any controversy on the bill—and I believe there is a minimum of controversy—this title is where it will appear and where the amendments will take place?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, that is true.

Mr. CRAMER. And, there are three or four amendments that should be adequately debated, and I ask the assurance of the gentleman from Alabama that he will not attempt to cut off debate on those amendments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; I do not intend to do that.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 58, after line 8, insert the following:

"The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, Devils Jumps Dam would be built on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in McCreary County, Ky. The reservoir would lie in Wayne, McCreary, and Pulaski Counties in Kentucky and Scott, Fentress, Morgan, Anderson, Campbell, and Pickett Counties in Tennessee. The dam would be 483 feet high and would have a length of 6,250 feet, and would be built of concrete. The reservoir would cover approximately 37,000 acres and have a drainage area of approximately 1,383 square miles.

The purpose of the dam would be flood control, power, and recreation. The power output would amount, on an average, to 475 million kilowatt-hours per year. Use of this power would be managed by the Southeastern Power Administration. It is estimated that the sale of this power would bring in approximately $12,079,000 annually.

It is estimated that 800,000 people would visit this area annually.

The benefit-cost ratio would be 1.8 to 1 so that the entire cost could be paid in 50 years. This project has one of the highest benefit-cost ratios of any dam proposed to be built in this area.

The people of McCreary County in which the dam would be built have a median family income of approximately $1,800 per year, and a per capita income of $516 per year.

This project is accepted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Power Commission, the State of Kentucky, the State of Tennessee; it has been recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers and there is no objection by the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce.

The Southeastern Power Administration is convinced that the power can be marketed at rates sufficient to recover all power costs within a 50-year period.

This project has been included in the Senate omnibus bill for rivers and harbors and has been passed by the other body three times, including this year. Since this is recognized by the other body to be a worthwhile project, I strongly urge this body to reconsider and vote for inclusion of this amendment.

Building this dam in McCreary County would tremendously improve the economy of that area and the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky. Industry always follows cheap sources of electric power and would undoubtedly move into this area. It would be transformed just as the Tennessee Valley area has been. Devils Jumps is a natural resource and is a property owned by the people. It would be used for their benefit and could best be used by construction of the Devils Jumps hydroelectric dam.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the gentleman who offers this amendment is sincere in having this project approved. That is only logical, for he is representing the people in his area.

Our committee had only limited hearings on this project this year, and did not allow the opponents to be heard; therefore, we do not have an adequate record in the printed record of the hearings of the full committee and subcommittee on this project to guide the Members of the House at this time.

Secondly, our subcommittee did have extensive hearings on this project 3 years ago, the last time a similar omnibus bill was before the House. In those hearings it was brought out that the TVA, which would be the nearest major user of power, does not desire or intend to use any power that might be produced by this project. We asked the Secretary of the Interior to indicate where this power would be used. It was indicated by the private power companies in the area that they did not require power from this source. It was brought out in the testimony it would be necessary to push this power up to areas in Indiana, Ohio, and even Michigan in order to provide some market for it, even though none of those areas indicated they desired the power. The result of the testimony 3 years ago indicated no assured consumer demand for this power, and because of that fact the Flood Control Subcommittee 3 years ago voted against this project. There has been no change so far as the uncertain use of this power is concerned, and for the Federal taxpayers to spend $151 million for this purpose now, without full hearings, would be highly unjustified.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great hue and cry from the proponents of this project that the area in which this plant will be constructed is in the Appalachia area and will provide much needed jobs for the unemployed. But let me squash that argument here and now.

NINETY-EIGHT PERCENT PUBLIC POWER

In the first place, the construction of this project—a hydroelectric project—would displace forever power supplied by coal-fired steam electric-generating plants consuming almost one-quarter million tons of coal per year, adding to unemployment and the very reasons that many of the Appalachia areas today are depressed is because of the loss of business by the coal industry. This will only compound the problem. Furthermore, if the Government hydroelectric power comes into this area it will prevent expansion of many existing generating facilities in Ohio and other depressed areas, perhaps even curtailing operations of those existing plants with subsequent reduction in tax revenue to the locality, making them even more depressed. It would lead to further reductions in coal consumption—increased unemployment, adding to the already enormous burdens of these underemployed areas located in Kentucky, Ohio, parts of Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Michigan as well.

Furthermore, any power produced by a Government project at this site will necessarily be marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration. Presently the Southeastern Power Administration does not have authority to go out of its original 10-State area and the Southeastern Power Administration has been marketing most of its power through TVA. However, TVA on at least two occasions has expressed its opposition to the purchase of any of this power because of its high cost. Furthermore, the Southeastern Power Administration has admitted it would have to go into Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and probably part of Pennsylvania to market this power and it has not made any study of the needs of those areas for additional power and has little knowledge of the area.

Furthermore, there are presently in operation five existing power projects with a combined output of 595,000 kilowatts, all of which are now under sale to TVA. In addition there is the Barkley project with a capacity of 130,000 kilowatts which is or about to be placed in operation.

There are an additional five Federal hydroelectric projects within the basin with a combined total of 212,500 kilowatts which have already been authorized but have not been constructed. So you now have in this area either authorized or constructed projects totaling a combined capacity of 937,500 kilowatts in addition to the 480,000 represented by Devils Jump. TVA has expressed a desire to renegotiate its present contract with Southeastern Power Administration so it can be released from some of the power it is now taking. In other words, the TVA has more now than it needs, and desires to get out of the obligation to market all of the existing power to say nothing of additional power represented by the Barkley project and the five additional projects heretofore authorized but not constructed. So

quite obviously, there is no need for this additional 480,000 kilowatts of peaking power in this area and by Southeastern Power Administration's own admission, they have little or no knowledge of a market elsewhere.

Furthermore, using the latest figures available, those of 1964, the simultaneous peak load of investor-owned companies in Ohio alone, were 11.2 million kilowatts. The generating capacity was 14 million kilowatts, 2.8 million kilowatts in excess of need, or in other words, 25 percent in excess of the load required—more than an ample reserve capacity. In addition to these there is an extremely large block of capacity available to most of the utilties in Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and Pennsylvania from the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. due to cutbacks in demand from the Atomic Energy Commission installation at Waverly, Ohio. Therefore, there is no need and no use for this enormous capacity that would be created by Devils Jump in any of the outlying areas outside of Southeastern Power Administration's present authority or more technically known as "power supply areas." Further, dependent upon the success of TVA in rescinding or revising its contract with Southeastern Power Administration to reduce the power purchased by it, Southeastern Power Administration will have the problem of finding markets for excess power of somewhere between 342,000 kilowatts and 937,000 kilowatts of Cumberland River Basin power and in addition to that the problem of some 480,000 kilowatts merely compounds the problem and is a complete waste of Federal funds to produce a product that is absolutely not needed.

Now to deal specifically with the justification of the cost-benefit analysis of the project. First let me remind you that Senate Document 97 setting forth the procedures by which projects of this type must be justified states that the usual practice is to measure the benefit in terms of the cost in achieving the same results by the most likely alternative means that would exist in the absence of the project. Neither in the hearings of the other body nor in the hearings of the House is there any evidence concerning what alternative method or means were used to determine the cost of achieving the same results by the Corps of Engineers. We do not know whether they used steam, pumped storage, jet engine, nuclear, or just what other types of generation or combinations thereof were used. However, the testimony before the House introduced by investor-owned companies, outlined three different types of installation which would achieve the same results. Three alternative methods of producing peaking capacity and energy, which are basic methods used in the electric utility industries were presented by the private investor-owned companies, each of which would be located in the areas which are claimed as potential markets by Devils Jump. The three were an overpressure system, pumped storage proposal, and an existing jet installation.

Further, a steam generating unit presently under construction on the Wabash River in Indiana could be expanded for a capital investment of $10.5 million, which would provide the same peaking capacity equivalent to the Devils Jump capacity which is estimated to cost $167 million. Furthermore, the annual cost of this capacity and energy would amount to only approximately $2 million, about 30 percent of the annual cost of the Devils Jump power.

The second alternative is a pumped storage project which could supply comparable peaking capacity at a total investment of $65 million at an annual cost of roughly $5 million, thereby producing the same type power annually at 82 percent of the annual cost of Devils Jump power with a capital investment of $65 million as compared to capital investment of $165 million at Devils Jump, and there are a number of pumped storage sites available in the Devils Jump area.

The third alternative—the jet engine—was used in a recent completed installation. This type of installation has the decided advantage of flexibility and can be located at the load center, thereby eliminating very substantial transmission investments and power loss. An analysis of this third alternative showed that 592,000 kilowatts, over 100,000 more kilowatts of peaking capacity than that claimed at Devils Jump, could be supplied by this third alternative by $39 million investment, or less than one-fourth of the Devils Jump investment, at an annual production cost of $4.8 million, or about 81 percent of the annual cost of the Devils Jump power. As usual, there is a maze of conflicting figures presented by the proponents of this project and the corps. In the hearings both in the other body and in the House, the Corps of Engineers in some instances used annual costs of $6.1 million, in others $6.8 million. It used, in some cases, benefits of $12 million, and in others benefits of $10.4 million. It used different interest rates. For example, it originally used 2½ percent, 2⅞ percent, then 3⅛ percent interest. It used different amortization and replacement costs and, in some cases, 100 years lifetime as opposed to 50-year lifetime.

Now you take all the fancy formulas and high-faluting methods to figure these projects you want but, when it all boils down the project only pays out through the sale of electricity. Now Southeastern Power Administration says it will sell this power. The project is to produce 475,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In 1962, the average rate for all power sold by Southeastern Power Administration was only 5.4 mills per killowatt hour. Take the claimed 475 million kilowatts and multiply by 5.4 mills, assuming you can sell this power, gives you an annual revenue of $2.5 million. Now compare this against what the proponents say it will cost annually to produce this power, that is $6.1 million or $6.8 both of which are the Corps figures and you have a loss annually of $3.6 million or $4.3 depending upon the figures you take. As a matter of fact, the cost would even be greater if you used the same interest rate the Federal Government is required to pay. Remember this: None of these figures includes the market cost, which is over $50 thousand annually, nor do they include the transmission cost or losses due to transmission. Further there would have to be an additional capital investment for the construction of transmission lines which are not now in existence in the area, and one last thing, if this project is constructed by the Federal Government, the Corps estimates that the annual loss of taxes would be $3.67 million and the sale of this power by Southeastern Power Administration would not return a sufficient sum to even offset this cost annually. So if you include the annual loss, representing the difference from the sale of power and the cost of production or the sum of $3.6 million, taking the lesser figure plus the annual loss of taxes of $3.67 million, you have a total annual loss of this project in excess of $7 million annually and over the life of the project, depending on what figure you use, a 50-year or a 100-year basis, you have a $350 million loss or a $700 million loss to the general taxpayer. I submit to you gentlemen that this project is not feasible, it is not needed in the area, it is a raid on the Treasury, adding to the enormous deficit, and creates additional loss of jobs and great hardships in the already depressed coal industry and Appalachian areas and this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, there is no flood control in this project. The Corps of Engineers has stated it did not take any benefit for flood control in this project because it does not add any flood control benefits to the system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that because this project is so controversial the committee did not even request testimony from the Corps of Engineers. No opportunity to cross-examine any of the witnesses nor the testimony placed in the record was given to the opponents of this project because the committee having had considerable experience and knowledge of this project over the years knew and felt that it was not justified and should not be included in the bill. As a matter of fact in 1962 and again in 1963 an effort was made to include it and it was defeated on both occasions. Again this year the committee obviously felt the project was not justified and therefore it was not placed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER] has been a very worthy and extremely able advocate of this project. I know of no other person who has worked harder or more ably in behalf of his district and this project. He has been very sincere and persuasive and I regret I find myself in disagreement with him. He has represented his people well.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee sustains the position of the Public Works Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OF MR. CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offer by Mr. CLARK: On page 41, strike out lines 3 through 12, inclusive.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, and Members, first, I intend to support all of the projects in the bill with the exception of the request for the authorization of $227 million to the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine. This is the largest single item in the bill and constitutes more than 10 percent of the total authorization. I am opposed to the Dickey project for the following reasons:

First, the project, despite its ultimate cost of more than $300 million, received only cursory examination on the Senate side. Public hearings were not held there. Furthermore, House hearings revealed that the project has not been adequately studied by either the Corps of Engineers or the Department of the Interior.

Second, the Secretary of the Interior admitted in public testimony that the private companies in the region had not even been consulted on the need for this power, and further that there were no marketing plans for the more than 95 percent of the power that will be exported from Maine.

Third, the project is opposed by the majority of the New England Congressmen because it will not even achieve its stated goal of helping to reduce the cost of power in the New England area. It will instead retard the construction of the large thermal-electric plants near the load centers of the region, and it is these large thermal plants that hold the best prospects for reducing power costs.

Fourth, the Interior Department used a 100-year payoff for the project instead of the usual 50 years. In actual fact the project may be obsolete before it is built and the output of the Federal power project may not be marketable due to its high cost.

Fifth, the electric companies of the region have offered concrete alternatives for the production of equivalent power at less cost, without spending a dime of Federal money. Thus, the project does not meet the basic criteria of the Congress that there be no better alternate.

Sixth, it is virtually a pure power project, with less than 5 percent recreational and flood control benefits, for a region that has no power shortage.

Seventh, as the largest project moneywise in the omnibus bill, it was narrowly approved by the entire Public Works Committee.

The Interior Department spokesman says there "are too many imponderables involved to give a precise reply" on the power.

The Department's July report to President Johnson discussed power costs this way:

It does not contend that the project will provide power locally at such a low rate as to act as a magnet to industry.

The report went on:

In the early years more of the power would be used in the Boston area.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen, the President has recently signed the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which provides a legal framework and funds for regional commissions like the Appalachia Commission, which will undoubtedly recommend extensive Federal regional development programs. I am certain the people of New England would benefit more from $300 million of these types of projects—roads, medical facilities, timber development, and perhaps water supply—than from the Dickey project. I intend to support all the other projects, but I cannot in good conscience sit here and allow this project to go through without stating my views.

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

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Can the gentleman give me a figure on the overall cost of this project?

Mr. CLARK. The cost, from this bill, is $227 million. There will be $80 million for transmission lines, which will make the project more than $300 million.

Mr. DADDARIO. The reason I ask that is in Connecticut we have a nuclear project underway.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CLARK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DADDARIO. We have a nuclear project in Connecticut at the moment which is costing some $127 million, which will combine with a fossil fuel program and which I understand will have a 5-mill cost. Can the gentleman go into that?

Mr. CLARK. I went into that earlier, I will say to the gentleman. The Yankee atomic plant received a $5 million Federal grant for research and development, all of which went to Westinghouse Electrict Co. In addition it had an interest-free use of fuel for 5 years, which amounted to a subsidy of $3.9 million. It is now operating entirely independently of the Government and naturally paying itself. Its output is in excess of what the St. John project will be able to support in 1972.

Mr. DADDARIO. And it will be, the Connecticut project, completed when?

Mr. CLARK. The project has a 100-year payoff.

Mr. DADDARIO. The Connecticut project will be completed much prior to the 1971 date, as I understand it.

Mr. CLARK. That is true.

Mr. DADDARIO. And at a lesser cost.

Mr. CLARK. And at much less cost.

Mr. DADDARIO. As I understand it, it provides power at under 5 mills and will produce electricity for use throughout the whole New England area.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, normally I have not been an advocate of public power as such. Nor has the Public Works Committee characteristically advocated public power where private investor-owned companies were capable of providing the needs.

A few years ago, in the Tennessee Valley bonding bill, the committee with my individual concurrence provided clearly that any expansion of generating capacity in the TVA area must stop at the limits of its present service region. We were extremely careful to make certain that there be no invasion of those areas now served by private power.

Just this year, in both the Appalachian bill and the Economic Development bill, the committee with my active help inserted language to guarantee that no funds could be used to develop any public power whatever in competition with the existing private power sources.

In considering the present bill, the committee rejected certain proposals which would have developed water resources in various parts of the country primarily for the public production of power.

In the St. John River project, however, we have a unique and impelling situation.

The one great roadblock which lies across the trail to commercial and industrial progress in New England is the extremely high price of electric power throughout that region.

The single most effective thing we can do to assist in the development of New England is to make it possible for New England citizens and businesses to purchase electric energy at rates more nearly in keeping with those the rest of us pay throughout the country.

As serious as any water crisis in New England is the electric supply in the area. It is a severe handicap to the area. New Englanders today are required to pay about 20 percent more for their electricity than are the citizens elsewhere in this Nation.

The 1963 census of manufacturers published by the Bureau of the Census concluded that power purchased by New England industries in 1962 cost those industries approximately 66 percent more than the average U.S. industrial rate. Transplanted into dollars, this means that New England industries would have saved $72 million that year had they been able to acquire electricity at the average U.S. rate.

The present project is designed to help equalize that appalling handicap. It has been carefully studied by both the Corps of Army Engineers and the Public Works Committee. On the basis of studious analysis, we have concluded that the project is highly feasible and economically well justified. The two sites on the river, the Dickey Dam and the downstream Lincoln Regulating Dam, would provide a combined supply of approximately 800,000 kilowatts to produce more than 1 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually.

By the terms of this project, this high load factor energy could be sold for as little as 7 mills per kilowatt-hour and still easily pay off the project. This would be only a little more than half

the present average of 13 mills per kilowatt-hour which New England electric consumers are paying today for their wholesale energy.

Peaking power would be sold for $15 per kilowatt a year as compared with the present going rate of $23.50 per kilowatt a year which the Federal Power Commission estimates as the cost of the most modern New England plants.

The opponents of this project are the New England power companies—the same companies which charge their consumers the highest rates for electricity in the Nation. These are the companies which Chairman Joseph Swidler, of the FPC, chastised when he noted that:

> New England is still an undeveloped power market * * * not since 1953 has a generating unit installed in New England been included among the first 20 in the Nation in efficiency.

Even under the rigorous standards of a 3¼-percent interest rate and a 50 year payout period with interest payments during construction, this project shows a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.8. In other words, according to the very conservative criteria used by the Corps of Army Engineers, this project will pay $1.80 in measurable benefits for each dollar of cost during every year of its existence.

This project has been attacked as being primarily one for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power. To a considerable degree, it is this. But this also means that the project will be almost 100 percent reimbursable with interest. And certainly nobody can say that any project in this Nation which will store 8 million acre-feet of badly needed water will serve no other purpose beyond power.

New England has been too long denied. This great and historic section of our Nation has waited patiently while the problems of other regions of our country have been assaulted. Members of Congress from New England have assisted the Western States through reclamation programs, have assisted the South and Midwest through agricultural programs, have assisted Appalachia through our bill earlier this year, have assisted the Atlantic and Gulf and Pacific Coast States through hurricane protection and beach erosion works.

The time has come for the rest of us to put aside whatever parochial reservations we may have, and assist New England with the solution of this critical problem through the enactment of this bill which is supported by a preponderate number of the Governors from New England and members of this committee and by each member of the delegation from the State of Maine.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement, and I want to expand this much on it. In that connection it was brought out very well in our hearings that the private power companies, when they talk about cheaper cost of developing electric energy, are not talking about cheaper cost to the consumer but they are talking about some relatively cheaper cost to the producing company. The cost to the consumer they would not predict as being cheaper. I would bring to the attention of the Committee that on the specific question of asking the private power companies an estimate of how much reduction in the price of power they would make to the consumer, they would make no response. So, so far as the consumer in New England is concerned, his condition will remain the same. They are at the mercy of the private power companies. I think we should follow the recommendation of this committee and bring in this new wonderful development on the St. John River.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, but I am going to support the amendment striking out this specific project in Maine.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River in Maine which is part of the omnibus public works bill, S. 2300.

I base my opposition on these points. This project, despite its ultimate cost of more than $300 million, received scant examination by the Senate and that body did not hold public hearings.

The House Public Works Subcommittee held hearings of only 2 days.

I think it is important that the members bear in mind that this project will not achieve its stated goal of helping to reduce the cost of the power in the New England area. In fact, it will hold back the construction of large thermal-electric plants near the load centers of the region. It is these plants that hold the best prospect for reducing power costs. Furthermore, the electric companies of the region have offered concrete alternatives for the production of equivalent power at less cost without the use of Federal money. This violates what has been a basic criteria of the Congress for many years regarding public power projects—there is no better alternative under free enterprise. For example, the great TVA was created because private capital was unable to do the job.

The Secretary of the Interior had admitted that the private companies in the region have not been consulted on the need for this project. But what is most astounding is that the Department of the Interior has made no plans for selling the electricity the two proposed powerplants would produce. Secretary Udall told the Flood Control Subcommittee, "We'll plan this after the project is authorized."

Also let me point out that the Department of the Interior used 100-year payoff for the project instead of the customary 50 years. There is also the possibility the project may be obsolete before it is completed, and the output may not be marketable due to its high cost.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

At the outset I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JONES] for his demonstrated concern for the northern New England area, in the face of determined opposition by special interest groups. There has been a most formidable array of forces alined against this project. In the 5 years I have been in Congress I have never seen a greater lobbying effort against an individual project. The opposition has been most intensive.

It is an undisputed fact that Maine is the principal beneficiary of this project. Maine is larger in size than the rest of New England. I appeal to you today on behalf of my State and its people.

I have been in public service for the major part of my adult life. During this time I have spoken in behalf of a great many measures before the State legislature and Congress designed to assist Maine; of all these proposals none have offered the potential that this project does for helping my State grow and prosper.

The State of Maine has the highest power rates in the Nation. This has placed an intolerable burden on Maine families and has seriously hampered our industrial effort. As a matter of fact it is the principal reason why Maine's chief export is its young men.

Some of my friends raise the time-worn argument that public power is bad per se, inasmuch as the private power companies should do the job. The answer to this shortsighted argument—in my State—is that private power interests have certainly had enough time to do the job and they have failed. Their promises are rather late.

These very same private power interests now opposing this bill have too long strangled the economic growth of my State.

It is alleged that atomic power development will make hydroelectric projects such as this obsolete. Yet the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Interior do not agree with this conclusion.

By 1980 there will be a requirement of 36 million kilowatts in the Northeastern part of North America, of which 4 million kilowatts will be needed for peaking purposes. The State of Maine alone will require 1,750,000 kilowatts. The Dickey-Lincoln School project could prove to be a valuable source of supply for this purpose at that time—even with atomic development.

It is estimated that firm energy can be delivered to Maine customers for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour compared with present charges ranging up to 20 mills, and peaking energy will be available at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It seems significant to me that this project has the support of the President of the United States, of the entire Maine congressional delegation, of the Governor of Maine and all the other New England Governors, and the Government agencies involved. The Atomic Energy Commission has stated that this project will produce lower-cost power than a nuclear alternative.

In transmitting a report on this project to Speaker McCormack, President Johnson said:

Authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln school project and the carrying forward of the other recommendations contained in the report is a highly important step in the future economic growth of the New England area.

The President went on to say that it would save New England power consumers over $9 million annually compared with present average costs, and more than $7 million each year compared with costs of alternative new sources of power supply.

I make no claim of knowing what the benefits may be for the rest of New England, although it seems probable that northern New England—Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—will benefit the most—and certainly Maine will benefit the most.

Maine is a great State and I do not think it detracts from its many attributes to state it is not the influential State it once was.

There was a time when Maine had 10 Members of this body. Today we have but two, my friend Bill Hathaway on the Democratic side of the aisle and myself on the Republican side. There was a time when Maine produced Speakers of the House, a Vice President of the United States, and a nominee for President. These days are long past.

With the failure of our population to grow at the rate of most other States, our influence waned. The largest single factor responsible for the lack of stable full-time job opportunities has been the tremendously high power rate structure.

Since coming to Congress in 1961, I have supported public works projects in other States without exception, because I relied upon the individual to know what was necessary and feasible for his own State. I hope that Members will reciprocate today in helping the State of Maine.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was a reference made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] or the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] in their colloquy as to whether or not there were actually facts brought out at the hearing relative to proposing a reduction of rates in the New England area if the power needs of that area continue to be provided by private enterprise in the form of investor-owned public utilities.

Mr. Chairman, we requested during the hearings that testimony be submitted to the committee on this issue, and on page 536 of the printed hearings appears the testimony submitted to us by the investor-owned private power companies in New England, stating that by 1980 they intended to reduce the power rates in that area by 40 percent and they intended to do so through nuclear plants.

Since the hearings I have before me a clipping from one of the newspapers in New England of September 8 announcing a contract for a nuclear energy plant awarded by three of the Vestal private utility companies in New England, a contract for $65 million to the General Electric Co. to build a nuclear energy plant in Connecticut, which would produce 600,000 kilowatts.

May I point out that if the $65 million contract for a nuclear energy plant is going to be constructed they will produce 600,000 kilowatts. The proposed public power project proposed in this bill at a cost of a total of $300 million, counting the transmission lines, would produce only 794,000 kilowatts. Therefore, this nuclear energy plant would produce almost an equivalent and cost one-fourth of the amount of the estimated cost of the public power facilities that would be proposed by the bill now before us. Therefore, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. I do not see any reason why the taxpayers of our respective congressional districts should be burdened with a $300 million cost when we have testimony before our committee that the private utilities of the area are meeting the power needs through the letting of a contract for a nuclear energy plant. Our best estimates are they can produce power that will be even lower in estimate made by the Department of the Interior.

For this reason I am in full support of the amendment. In view of the anticipated large deficit in our budget this year I see no reason why we should spend this large amount of money up there.

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

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I want to say I agree with the gentleman's statement. I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I fully agree with the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], to the effect that private interests are ready, willing, and able to take care of the foreseeable power needs of New England and that there is no need for the authorization of this project.

Particularly in Connecticut is this the case, where our companies have not only established atomic-powered plants to produce electric energy, but have joined with other out-of-State power producers to create the larger operating unit which will be necessary to provide the technology, the volume and the lower cost power that the future will require.

One other fact has not been mentioned and that is that the cost of operation of these private companies involves the payment of taxes and the contribution of interest by the companies which are also paying dividends to thousands of stockholders throughout the area.

Finally, one might ask whether it is logical at this time of enormous public expenditures, in a bill which spends $1.9 billion and in the face of sharply mounting costs of carrying on the war effort in Vietnam that we should tack another $300 million on to the taxpayers' bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am concerned that the Dickey-Lincoln School project be approved. This project is located in my district and of course would benefit my people considerably. It goes without saying that the construction alone would create welcome jobs, income, and opportunity for many of the residents of Maine. But the construction of this project would mean more than simply the creation of onsite benefits. Materials from every portion of the country would be utilized. In the construction of the Trinity Dam in California, for example, tractors and conveyors came from Illinois, trucks from Indiana and Pennsylvania, steel from Ohio, generators from New York, cranes, shovels, and draglines from Wisconsin—plus a myriad of products produced under contract or subcontract in many other States. The same was true of Glen Canyon in Arizona, of Hungry Horse in Montana, of Hartwell on the Savannah River—and it will be equally true of Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. While this House approves construction of a project for Maine, it is also approving it for all America. In addition to the widespread benefits resulting from the construction the finished product will also be national in scope because it will help fulfill our objective to reduce power costs throughout the Nation and bring to every corner of our country a stimulus for greater economic growth. In every area where the Federal Government has constructed hydroelectric projects the private as well as the public utilities have prospered, low-cost power has increased the demand for power from every source. The creation of jobs, income, and opportunity have been the direct result of water resource development in the Northwest, the Southwest, and the Southeast. We can justifiably expect the same for this project in the Northeast, an area far from the coal, oil, and gas resources of the Nation, where power rates are the highest in the country, and where water is the prime natural resource for power.

Coal, oil, and gas once burned are gone forever. Nor is it enough to say that we might replace them with nuclear energy. Grave problems of waste disposal, unresolved questions concerning possible risk to public health, and high costs, all obscure the extent to which the country will convert to nuclear power. I trust these problems will be solved, and I am confident that the cost of nuclear fuels will be reduced, but hydroelectric generators may well remain our best source of power, because falling water is free.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project is an integral part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill for water resource development throughout the country. It is no more equitable to strike this project than to strike any of the other 143 projects in this bill. The entire parcel has been carefully considered by the Public Works Committee and that committee in presenting this bill is presenting us with an answer to a national problem. Like the elementary and secondary education bill, the Higher Education Act, the omnibus housing bill, and the omnibus farm bill and many other pieces of

legislation which we have passed at this session, this omnibus rivers and harbors bill is national in scope and should be kept intact in order to accomplish its objective of providing nationwide water resource development.

Over 60 years ago Senator J. H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire, rose to voice his support of the Reclamation Act of 1902. His support was based, he said, on the fact that development of the West would add to the development of the entire Nation. Since 1902 water resource development west of the Mississippi has totaled $11.2 billion. In the Southeast the Federal investment has totaled $5.5 billion. In New England, however, water resource development investment has been only $413 million. The authorization of this project will make the total investment since 1902 still less than $1 billion but it will be a giant step toward providing low-cost power to every part of our Nation.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend our distinguished colleague on the fine statement he is making, and I commend him for the hard fight and the hard work he has put into this matter. The development of the resources of the State of Maine is important to all the country, and I think most of the country will support the gentleman in the advocacy of this project.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks let me simply say this.

If the residents on one side of Main Street in your home town were paying $10 a month for power while the people on the other side of the street were paying $30 a month for power you would think it was ridiculous. In this day and age it is just as ridiculous for the people of Portland, Oreg., to be paying less than one-half the amount for electricity than the people of Portland, Maine, are currently charged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLARK and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote by tellers, the ayes are 100, noes 99.

The Chair votes in the negative.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] what the leadership's plans in regard to the pending bill are. We on this side are prepared to act on the bill today, if possible. I understand now that it may be put over until tomorrow. The membership would like to know.

Mr. BLATNIK. There are some engagements which a number of the Members of the House are committed or obligated to attend this evening. It is my understanding that the leadership on both sides strongly endorse the proposal that the Committee rise around 6 o'clock. So if the gentleman has no objection, I am prepared to make a motion that the Committee now do rise, and we shall return at noon tomorrow.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it proper for the Chair to make a tie or to break a tie, from a parliamentary standpoint, on a teller vote?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the Chair can vote to make or break a tie, the Chair informs the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. That was my recollection. I believe I lost an amendment that way a couple of years ago. I wanted to make sure, for the record

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. I should like to ask the Chairman if we are going to continue tonight or not. I should think, in view of what has transpired in the last couple of weeks, we should go ahead and finish our business. We have been inconvenienced many times. Let us keep on doing it.

Mr. BLATNIK. We are prepared—I certainly am; and, in fact, all of the Committee Members are—to go ahead, but I believe in all fairness to Members who, by coincidence, have a serious conflict with obligations, we should not. Let me make the statement that I am prepared to move that the Committee rise now. I shall not at this moment. I believe we are over the hump. There are probably four amendments of any substance left.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman, so far as I am concerned we are here. We are prepared to go ahead and finish the bill. There seems to be a great demand for these bills at this time. We have an opportunity to finish this bill today. So far as I am concerned, I have had a number of requests on this side that we finish the bill today. If the gentleman wishes, so far as we are concerned, we are ready to go ahead and finish it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. CRAMER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 130, noes 72.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just under discussion.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on September 17 I was absent due to official business, the dedication of the Shenango Valley Dam in Mercer County, Pa. Consequently I missed rollcall No. 307. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

CHRYSLER CORP. ANNOUNCES PRICE INCREASES FOR 1966 MODELS

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, in today's newspapers the Chrysler Corp. has announced its new price schedule for the 1966 models. By coincidence, which I consider more planned than strange, the increase is just about equal to the amount of the excise tax reduction which was voted by this Congress several months ago.

The explanation of the corporation is that this added price includes the cost of safety devices. When these safety devices are installed on all the automobiles produced by the manufacturer, the actual cost to the company will be about $22 to $24 per car. It looks as though the manufacturers contemplate an extra profit of $45 to $70 per automobile. If all of the other manufacturers agree to the same pricing policies—and I would suppose they have that in their plans, an average profit increase of $50 per car would apply to 7½ or 8 million new cars to be produced next year.

I do not believe that the Congress intended to give the automobile industry an extra profit of $350 million to $400 million by reducing the excise taxes this year. It looks as though the automobile industry is reneging on its promise of less than 1 year ago to pass the excise tax reduction on to the American consumer.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, GO HOME

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of yesterday, September 20, summarized the feeling of those in Government and out for the latest bit of meddling by Martin Luther King in an editorial aptly titled, "Martin Luther King, Go Home." There is a great deal of concern in every quarter of the Nation over the role this professional wowser has recently taken upon himself, that of a Secretary of State without portfolio. And, I might add, without invitation and without qualifications.

For years, the South has been saying the same thing, "Martin Luther King, go home," and for exactly the same reason the Star points out in this editorial: that he is a meddler and unqualified to tell others how to run either their government or their personal affairs. The fact that he is a Negro gives him the right, in the eyes of the deluded liberals, to meddle in any affair in which any other Negro is involved. Yet the record shows that, wherever his presence is felt, there has been bloodshed, strife, and anarchy. His "nonviolence" has bred violence. His "leadership" has turned loose the rampaging mob. His "peace" has fomented hatred at a time when cool heads and reasoning was needed.

I welcome to the chorus of voices raised in protest, the Washington Star. They have put in print with this editorial the truth that cannot be denied: that a meddler is a meddler whether he meddles in Vietnam or the South. He can cause nothing but trouble.

I hope the President does, in this instance, what should have been done years ago, order this troublemaker to the sidelines.

The Star editorial is inserted here for everyone's attention:

MARTIN LUTHER KING, GO HOME

"Homespun collars and homespun hearts wear to rags in foreign parts," said Houseman, and it is also true of homespun charisma, homespun mana, and plain old homespun reputation. Of no one is it truer than of Dr. Martin Luther King, the homemade foreign policy expert.

There is something positively ridiculous about Dr. King hobnobbing around the U.N. with Ambassador Goldberg and solemnly delivering himself of pronunciamentoes on international relations. He wants peace in Vietnam. Who doesn't? The Vietcong, perhaps, and perhaps the North Vietnamese, neither of whom are listening except as one listens for signs of weakness in the enemy.

And Dr. King avers that Red China ought to be admitted to the United Nations. This is an endlessly complicated question full of commitments to many nations and a generation of history, none of which seems to have registered on Dr. King. It is not a question that is about to be solved by the mindless repetition of fringe-group slogans.

Beyond specifics, there is the interesting assumption that Dr. King is somehow qualified to hold an informed opinion in these matters, let alone to express it in public with the apparent approbation of his Government. He gets his qualification from his work in the civil rights movement which has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the area he now surveys.

The further assumption about his new role is that, in his view, the civil rights question is now solved and needs him no longer. If this is indeed the case, surely there are other fields even more desperately in need of his ministrations. The Broadway stage, for one, has been in trouble for years and so has our local ball club. What about the newspaper strike in New York? Or the rising hemline on women's dresses?

If he thinks about it at all, Dr. King can find a hundred fields of human endeavor in which he can do less harm and in which he is at least as well qualified as in foreign policy.

INCREASE IN SBA REVOLVING FUND AUTHORIZATION

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the revolving fund authorization of the Small Business Administration from $1,725 million to $2 billion. When Public Law 89-78 was passed on July 21, increasing the SBA revolving fund authorization for purposes of the investment company program, the total authorization set out in section 4(c) of the act was not correspondingly increased. This bill will correct that oversight. One hundred twenty million dollars of the proposed increase is for that purpose.

There should, however, be a substantial increase in the revolving fund authorization for the business loan and disaster loan programs. This bill also contains an authorization increase of $159 million for these programs.

We all remember too well the necessity for curtailment of the business loan program during the latter part of 1964 and the first part of 1965 because of the extensive call on disaster funds as a result of the Alaska earthquake and other disasters during 1965. This should not happen again.

On June 30, 1965, the Small Business Administration's appropriation balance was approximately $40 million for all of its financial assistance programs, including the disaster loan program; $150 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1966. As a result, the SBA had available no more than $190 million for the entire fiscal year, plus repayments.

It is expected that the demands on the revolving fund as a result of the hurricane which struck southern Florida, Louisiana, and the gulf coast will more than deplete the available balance now outstanding.

The total authorization balance to which additional funds may be appropriated is only $76 million at this time. If all of those funds were appropriated, it is doubtful if they could supply the funding need as a result of the recent hurricane, alone. We may have other hurricanes—we may have other disasters—and certainly our small business loan program should go on.

It is time that we be realistic—it is time that those who request the appropriations should plan ahead in order that these programs established by Congress may be maintained.

We must not fail to be prepared for disasters. We must not allow the revolving fund and appropriations for the purposes of the disaster and business loan programs to be at such a dangerous low that further curtailment may again become necessary.

There are those who feel that if a substantial increase in the revolving fund is not now made available and if substantial supplemental appropriations are not now requested by the Small Business Administration, that agency will again be out of funds by the end of the year. If so, the small business loan program and the disaster program will suffer severe curtailment.

These are not wasted funds—they are not grants or giveaways—these funds expended by the Small Business Administration are investments in the future of America.

It is not necessary that the full authorization be utilized—it is not necessary that all funds appropriated be spent. But it is necessary that a sufficient backlog in funds exists to protect the whole program. To fail to maintain a substantial balance available for these programs is to fail to anticipate the possible needs of millions of Americans and to play with the future of small business.

The revolving fund authorization should be increased at this time.

"PERCOLATE UP" VERSUS "TRICKLE DOWN"—THE SUCCESS OF THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TO ECONOMICS—NO PLACE FOR SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, I have had the privilege of serving on the Joint Economic Committee and, through that, have had some opportunity to observe the functioning of our economy. In that time, there was one fundamental principle that has been reaffirmed time and time again. That is that purchasing power which is made available to the people of the country is spent over and over again, and percolates up to the great advantage of the economy. But when measures are adopted to benefit the self-acclaimed "chosen few" rich and give them special privileges, the money does not trickle down. It is sometimes siphoned off into luxury spending, Swiss bank accounts, and so forth, so that the plain people never see it.

TWENTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLARS ADDED TO OUR GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT—MORE TO COME

We have excellent proof of these observations in the 1964 income and corporation tax cuts. The Council of Eco-

nomic Advisers has made a very careful study of their effect on the economy, and has concluded that the reductions in personal and corporation taxes have already added $25 billion to our gross national product—up to now. Moreover, for the balance of this year, at least $10 billion more in increase is expected. Next year, there will be further increases in the gross national product attributable to the tax cut. When we stop to think about this, it makes very good sense.

When consumers get a tax break they spend the money for things they need and this stimulates business in the community so that larger orders are placed in the factories and, with more business, the producers are able to increase their production and expand. So the effect of an increase in purchasing power spreads throughout the economy and multiplies itself and results in a much greater increase in the total production of goods and services.

EXCISE TAX ALSO HELPS ECONOMY

Another case in point is the excise tax cut enacted this year. While it is still early in the game, so to speak, to get the final results, it is obvious that these reductions are providing a powerful economic stimulus because they have permitted price reductions that aid the American consumer. The estimated total of reduction, $4.6 billion, will have a multiplier effect on the economy. If passed along to the consumer as intended by the Congress, this reduction can add $15 billion to our gross national product. Moreover, these beneficial effects do not die out in a year or so, but continue to benefit the economy.

These tax reductions are an excellent illustration of why it is important to base our economic performance on healthy, strong, purchasing power. In economics as in politics, strength begins at the grassroots—with the people of the country.

ECONOMIC PRIVILEGE LEADS TO ECONOMIC WEAKNESS

The road to economic privilege is the road to economic weakness and political weakness, as well. There should be no place in American law for special advantages for the wealthy—be it special advantages under the tax laws, special treatment under the Bank Holding Company Act as the Du Pont Trust is attempting to maintain, or special privileges under the now proposed amendments to the Bank Merger Act which would absolve six of the largest banks in the country from violations under the antitrust laws.

THE REPUBLICANS' TIME-HONORED CURE-ALL—RAISE THE INTEREST RATES AND TIGHTEN MONEY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republican Party issued a so-called position paper entitled "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain, and Your Dollar." Enshrined in this ill-fated attempt to establish a proper prognosis for our balance-of-payments ills, is the Republican's time-honored cure-all, tight money, and high interest rates.

In the many years that I have been privileged to serve in the House, it has become more than apparent to me that high interest rate policy is a selfish attempt by a few to stifle economic growth for the short-sighted benefit of a small number of the rich and powerful. The facts are all too evident to prove this case.

I am saddened at my Republican colleagues who are damning one of the tools that have caused this Nation's economy to be more prosperous than any in the history of man. Perhaps the Republicans are suggesting that this country adopt the stifling economic policies of some of the European nations.

The Republican Party has always praised the indigenous genius of our material success, but why, I wonder, are they seeking to destroy this quality now? I hope my colleagues on the opposite side will ponder the disastrous effects that a credit squeeze and high interest rates would cause. Blindness to the disastrous actions of the 1920's and the recession policies of the Eisenhower administration is no defense for present manmade blindness. The recommendations of this policy statement will cause the Nation's economy and citizens untold hardship that result from recession and a depression policy of tight money and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that an editorial from the Washington Post of September 13, 1965, be placed in the RECORD for a further elucidation on the fallacies of this Republican position paper.

THE GOP ON THE B-O-P

The Republican Party's publication of position papers on major issues—full discussions in which arguments proceed in orderly fashion from promises to conclusions—is surely contributing to a higher level of political discourse. But the latest effort, "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain, and Your Dollar," is more likely to generate heat than shed light.

Some of the GOP's strictures on our balance-of-payments (B-O-P) policies are well placed. It is true, for example, that the efforts to stanch the outflow of capital are, over the longer run, self-defeating. And one can hardly fault the authors of the statement when they charge that those restraints are inhibiting the expansion of world trade.

When they pass from diagnosis to prescription, however, the GOP doctors seem to throw caution to winds. They advocate a monetary policy that "will narrow interest-rate differentials between the United States and other countries" and judging from the remark about the administration's policy of artifically low rates, it is we who would have to come up to the high European level. But boosting long-term rates to the 6–7 percent range prevailing in Europe would result in a recession in the American economy.

A second quarrel with the GOP is over a matter of political timing. It proposes that our European military force of some 700,000 should be replaced by a small detachment, a move that would reduce the payments deficit by more than $1 billion. But is this the time, on the eve of West German elections, to propose a sharp reduction of American forces in Europe? At some time in the future such a proposal might be appropriate. To implement it now would involve a political sacrifice, the cost of which—if indeed it can be calculated—would far exceed the improvement in the balance of payments.

The document concludes with the warning that the party in power must be responsible for the consequences of the failures to solve the payments problem. That is true, but the opposition party would do well to think through the consequences of its own policy recommendations.

PROPOSALS MADE TO REJUVENATE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House have been advised from time to time, the Nation's privately owned commercial shipping fleet is rapidly approaching obsolescence. Many of these vessels were built during World War II and they are economically outmoded by the more modern ships of Europe's maritime nations. A large proportion of the merchant fleet will be far past the official 25-year useful age before they can be replaced under the present Maritime Administration's rebuilding program of 16 to 18 vessels annually.

The defense, as is well known, is budgetary. Under present practices, the Government pays 50 percent or slightly more, of the cost of constructing vessels, which is a difference between cost in foreign yards and in the United States. As a result, the budgets of the past few years have included approximately $100 million toward the building of the 16 to 18 vessels approved by Maritime.

Now the Shipbuilders Council of America has come forward with a program of deferred financing, both for the presently subsidized operators who must replace their vessels at the end of 25 years service and for urgently needed new construction of tramp ships and other bulk carriers, of which this country is sadly lacking.

In a letter to Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, the president of the Shipbuilders Council, Edwin M. Hood, has outlined a procedure developed by Ernst & Ernst, accountants and finance research specialists, whereby the 50 new vessels per year that will be required for the next 5 years to prevent block obsolescence can be built for lower expenditures than are now being provided annually.

Not only will such step-up construction place U.S. shipping in a truly competitive position with all the world, but the Ernst & Ernst figures forecast both a pronounced reduction in operating and construction subsidies and a greater efficiency in operation of these newer modern vessels.

Full details of the plan have been supplied to House Members directly concerned with maritime finances and operations, and a comprehensive summary

of the Ernst & Ernst findings is submitted herewith.

REVEALS PLAN TO REJUVENATE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE WITHOUT ADDITIONAL FEDERAL SUPPORT FUNDS

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has been advised by the spokesman for the Nation's private shipyard industry that the long-overdue expansion and modernization of the Nation's overaged merchant fleet can be accomplished without imposing any additional drain on the Federal Treasury.

This was made known today by Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, who released the findings of a special research study commissioned by his trade association which reveals that a large-scale fleet replacement program could be undertaken within existing levels of governmental support of the merchant marine. The study was made by the accounting firm of Ernst & Ernst. Also made public was the text of a September 9 letter which Hood sent to Secretary Connor with a copy of the 58-page research report.

In essence, the report recommends modification of existing procedures which require the Government to pay virtually in a lump sum up to 55 percent of the construction cost of a subsidized ship by the time of delivery. It suggests that the Government's share of the cost be spread over the 25-year economic life of the ship. Under the annual amortization plan, according to the report, the annual cost to the Government of a $10 million ship, at a differential subsidy of 50 percent, would be $320,000 rather than $5 million paid upon delivery of the vessel.

In his letter of transmittal to Secretary Connor, Hood pointed out: "A principal factor in the present maritime problem is the requirement that 20 years of construction activity must be compressed into the next few years due to obsolescence of World War II vessels. The amortization approach then represents a unique solution to the troublesome problem of block obsolescence—how to level yearly capital expenditures by the Federal Government for subsidizing vessel construction while at the same time improving the quality of the fleet. Moreover, from our standpoint, it offers a logical answer to the question—how to utilize idle U.S. shipyard capacity for the construction of U.S. flag ships with consequent employment for U.S. workers without placing an extraordinary burden on the Public Treasury."

Hood also stressed that the Ernst & Ernst study had exposed serious shortcomings in the Government's Interagency Maritime Task Force's analysis of a recent proposal calling for an expansion of the U.S.-flag tanker and bulk carrier fleet.

The shipyard's spokesman told Secretary Connor "we cannot escape the impression that the Interagency Maritime Task Force has engaged in expediency and a certain amount of superficiality, almost to the point of seeming to fortify a preconceived contraposition." He then cited seven specific analytical and statistical deficiencies which, he contends, distorted the task force's evaluation of the Kheel report.

The Ernst & Ernst study revealed that the U.S. merchant fleet is composed predominantly of ships which will reach the end of their useful lives simultaneously within the next few years. And, it pointed out, the shipping industry lacks an effectual mechanism to provide the capital needed to replace these ships with modern vessels. Merely keeping pace with the obsolescence overtaking the existing fleet would require the construction of 50 large ships per year for the next 5 years at an annual capital investment of $536 million.

A program to increase the U.S.-flag vessels' carriage of the Nation's foreign trade tonnage from the present level (below 9 perecnt) to 25 percent by 1975 would require the construction of 65 ships annually for the next 5 years at a capital expenditure of $700 million annually. To achieve a 50 percent participation in the foreign trade movement, 111 ships per year would have to be built during this period at an annual cost of $1,173 million.

In recent years, Government expenditures to sustain the American-flag merchant fleet have averaged about $390 million annually. Approximately $300 million is accounted for by direct subsidies to place the subsidized operators of 300 ships on a cost parity with their foreign-flag competitors. (Roughly $200 million is represented by operating subsidies and approximately $100 million has been for ship construction subsidies.) Additionally, the Government has paid about $90 million annually in the form of premium cargo rates to the so-called nonsubsidized operators for the transportation of Government-sponsored cargoes.

The $100 million for subsidized ship construction has resulted in orders for an average of 15 or 16 ships per year for subsidized operators. The nonsubsidized segment of the fleet, however, has not received Federal assistance for new ship construction. As a consequence, this fleet is composed nearly exclusively of inefficient, overaged vessels of World War II vintage.

Since the ship operators, particularly the nonsubsidized lines, haven't the capital to undertake ship construction without Government assistance, and the Government has shown no inclination to expand the subsidized ship construction program, the ways and means to accomplish replacement of the obsolete vessels has been the major dilemma faced by the Government and the private maritime industry, it was pointed out.

The solution to this problem, according to the Ernst & Ernst report, is replacement of the existing construction subsidy procedures with a construction amortization plan which would permit a massive ship replacement program to be undertaken without the concurrent requirement of increased construction subsidy appropriations. The plan, it was emphasized, not only would retain the foreign cost-parity benefits received by presently subsidized lines, but also extend them to the nonsubsidized lines engaged in foreign trade. Additionally, 44 new vessels for the domestic fleet could be built with an annual amortization subsidy of only $15 million.

Under the proposed amortization plan the Government would equalize the ship construction cost disparity between United States and foreign shipyards by paying the ship operator an amount each year which would reduce the annual mortgage payment for a ship to the level that would have been incurred had the ship been built at foreign price levels. Accordingly, the ship operator would obtain mortgages from private lending institutions covering the entire cost of the ship, less the 12½-percent investment required by law. The Government would compensate the operator for the United States versus foreign construction differential each year over the 25-year economic life of the ship—rather than paying the entire cost differential in 1 or 2 years while the ship is being built. The following example explains how the proposed amortization plan would work:

a. Assume a ship would cost $10 million if built in U.S. shipyards and $5 million in foreign shipyards.

b. Under the present plan, the ship operator would receive a $5 million construction subsidy payment from the Government at the outset. He would mortgage $3,750,000 of the remaining $5 million payable over 25 years; the balance of $1,250,000 would come from his own reserves.

c. Under the amortization subsidy plan, the operator would procure an additional mortgage for $5 million which would be retired by the Government over 25 years. Assuming a 4-percent interest rate (approximately the current rate for long-term Treasury bonds), the Government's annual payment would be $320,000, rather than $5 million paid by delivery.

In outlining the benefits which would accrue from the proposed construction amortization plan, the Ernst & Ernst report cited the following examples:

The annual cost to the Government, including operating-subsidy and construction amortization payments, of the subsidized fleet would be reduced by $14 million. In addition, two-thirds of the present annual construction subsidy, or $67 million, would be unnecessary.

The annual cost to the Government of the nonsubsidized fleet employed in foreign trade (if it were replaced with new ships via the construction amortization plan) would be reduced by $24 million. (The present annual Government outlays in the form of premium cargo rates paid for cargo preference shipments amount to $91.3 million.)

A new domestic dry cargo fleet of 34 freighters and 10 bulk carriers to meet future needs could be attained with an annual amortization subsidy of $15 million.

The net effect of implementing all three programs would be an annual reduction of $23 million in terms of operating subsidy payments at present levels. Since these calculations include the construction amortization subsidy, $67 million per year presently programed for replacement of about 200 ships to be constructed by the subsidized lines over the next 13 or 14 years would not be necessary—or would be available for fleet expansion.

Increasing the capacity of the dry cargo fleet to a size adequate to carry all our domestic oceanborne commerce plus 25 percent of our foreign commerce would result in an additional annual subsidy expenditure of $66 million. Of that amount $31 million would be for amortization subsidy.

In his letter of transmittal to Secretary Connor, Hood indicated that the interest costs to the Government inherent in the amortization plan would be offset by the interest earnings effect resulting from the Government's delayed capital expenditure.

For further information, please contact: Walter E. Oates, Assistant to the President, Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

MAINTAINING FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. WELTNER. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of my Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, introduced H.R. 48 on January 4, 1965.

This bill would make firms who solicit and knowingly obtain unfair price advantage, including secret rebates, equally guilty of antitrust law violations with those who grant them. It would provide further substance to the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 by enforcing the prohibition of secret rebates between buyer and seller.

In a recent poll of the National Federation of Independent Business, 61 per-

cent favored this legislation, 34 percent opposed, and 5 percent were undecided.

I want to commend Chairman PATMAN for his continued interest in the small businessman. I applaud his efforts to maintain the integrity of our free enterprise system.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON THE UNITED NATIONS OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a news release from the Republican Task Force on the United Nations of the House Republican Conference. Included is the news release and the statement of the task force. The text of both follow:

On the eve of the convening of the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations, the House of Representatives Republican Task Force on the United Nations called upon President Johnson to exercise positive and constructive U.S. leadership in the Assembly session.

The Republican Task Force is chaired by Congressman JOHN ANDERSON of Illinois. The other members are:

FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio.
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD of California.
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois.
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI of Pennsylvania.
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH of Kansas.
CARLETON J. KING of New York.
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS of Maryland.
CHARLES A. MOSHER of Ohio.
BEN REIFEL of South Dakota.
STANLEY R. TUPPER of Maine.
CHESTER L. MIZE of Kansas.
J. WILLIAM STANTON of Ohio.

The task force cited several areas in which the United States could take responsible initiatives to help strengthen the world organization: Establishing reasonable and firm procedures for the financing of U.N. operations by all of the members, encouraging more effective machinery for U.N. peacekeeping efforts, establishing guidelines for relations between the world organization and regional collective security organizations, such as the Organization of American States, calling for further U.N. study and efforts to deal effectively with the worldwide population explosion, and withholding membership in the U.N. to Red China.

STATEMENT OF THE TASK FORCE

As the United Nations enters its third decade, it is more necessary than ever that a viable world organization with the prestige accumulated in a number of successful peacekeeping efforts in the past, should receive the wholehearted active support of the U.S. Government.

It is necessary that the United States exercise firm and consistent leadership in the U.N. session now opening.

The prolonged financial crisis of the organization and the decision by the administration to ignore the charter after originally insisting upon its rigid application have greatly undermined confidence in the capacities of the United Nations. It is, therefore, of the greatest urgency that the Johnson administration take positive steps to reestablish our country's position of leadership within the United Nations in order to serve the noble purposes for which it was founded 20 years ago.

The administration has made a faltering start. Its decision to retreat on the U.N. financing issue was made without serious effort to secure equivalent Soviet concessions.

The administration's decision to shut its eyes to past violations of article 19 of the charter does not assure the successful financing of future U.N. operations. We hope that the administration will seek an eminently fair formula for assuring the United Nations of the funds needed to act—without casting upon the United States alone the burden of maintaining the financial solvency of the world organization.

There are two specific areas where U.N. peacekeeping operations could be strengthened. The first would be an expansion of personnel and functions of the Military Advisors Group in the Office of the Secretary General. The Military Advisors Group should be able to advise the Secretary General of forces available for any operation in which he is authorized to act and it should be capable of effective coordination in the establishment and functioning of U.N. peacekeeping forces in any threat to the peace.

Last June, a proposal was made by several Republican Members of the Congress to establish a U.S. first brigade of 1,000 technicians and logistical experts in a peacekeeping force earmarked for the use of the United Nations in peacekeeping emergencies. This proposal merits administration support. Another problem that needs attention is the competition between the United Nations peacekeeping machinery and that of regional international bodies. The dispatch of a United Nations mission to the Dominican Republic last spring when the OAS already had a mission on the spot complicated the task of the Inter-American organization. This kind of competition makes peacekeeping operations more difficult.

Steps should be taken during the forthcoming session of the General Assembly to assure serious consideration of more efficacious ways by which regional organizations can function without either (a) impinging upon the authority of the world organization, or (b) allowing a period of buck-passing between the U.N. and the regional grouping to prolong a crisis and threat to the peace.

Not the least important program of the U.N. which the United States should back is its measures to meet the problems arising out of the population explosion in the underdeveloped countries. A beginning has been made; the task force calls for positive action to go forward in this direction.

Communist governments may launch a campaign to grant membership in the United Nations to Red China. It is hoped that the administration will maintain the past record of U.S. delegations to the U.N., under both the Republican and Democratic Presidents, in successfully defeating any such move. The daily record of Red Chinese involvement in wars in Asia forms an eloquent testimony that by no stretch of the imagination can Red China be considered a "peace-loving nation," a requirement which the U.N. Charter specifies for its members.

URBAN RENEWAL IN NORTH HARVARD STREET, ALLSTON, MASS., REVISITED

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 19 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the sorry story of the Boston Redevelopment Authority's attempts to oust low- and moderate-income families from perfectly good homes to make way for a luxury apartment building in the North Harvard Street area of Allston, Mass. A number of events have occurred since that time that deserve mention, which are detailed in the newspaper accounts and letters I will include at the close of my remarks.

First, the residents of North Harvard Street chartered a bus and visited the Capitol of the United States to see democracy in action. Dr. Robert Weaver, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, refused to see the delegation on the grounds that this was a local matter, despite the requirement in the 1964 Housing Act that the Administrator must make a finding that rehabilitation cannot achieve the objectives of the urban renewal plan before a clearance project such as the North Harvard Street project can be put into operation. I was successful, however, in arranging a meeting between the delegation and William Slayton, the Urban Renewal Commissioner.

Later that day, three members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation responded to the pleas of the residents of the North Harvard Street urban renewal area and called on URA Commissioner Slayton to seek a halt in the demolition and evictions being carried on by the Boston Redevelopment Authority until a review of the planned clearance and high income reuse could be made. It is my understanding that activity in general has been at a standstill since that time, and I think our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] deserves a great deal of credit in this regard. Joining him in the appeal were Senators SALTONSTALL and EDWARD KENNEDY. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is quoted in the Boston Herald of August 17, 1965, as describing the area as "basically a good one," and I am inclined to agree with him after seeing pictures of the well-kept houses and yards.

I have been informed, however, that the Federal officials in the New York urban renewal regional office, after a very cursory examination of the North Harvard Street urban renewal project area, have declared it unfit for rehabilitation and thus marked it for clearance. This is contrary not only to what Members of Congress have observed about the conditions of the area, but runs in the face of findings by groups ranging from the Massachusetts Committee on Discrimination in Housing, local and State Democratic representatives, the League of Women Voters, 10 of the top ranking city planners in the State, and the Democratic City Council of Boston itself. A possible reason for the reluctance to act on the part of Federal and local officials is outlined in a letter from a member of

the American Institute of Planning and the former director of the special Massachusetts State Committee on Low Income Housing, Chester W. Hartman, which I will include at the end of my remarks. Mr. Hartman considers this reluctance to be based on a desire to punish the residents of the area for their action in opposing the powers that be within the urban renewal machinery of Boston.

Mr. Logue, the Boston Redevelopment Authority director, has characterized his opposition in the North Harvard Street project controversy as a group of outsiders, and a band of hard-core irresponsibles. I recently received a copy of a letter directed to Mr. Logue from one of these people, Mr. Donald C. Byron, chairman, Cambridge Friends of North Harvard Street. Mr. Byron notes that the group of irresponsibles is made up, almost entirely, of Harvard graduates and property owners, between the ages of 35 and 80, all Democrats and liberals, and includes four or five members of some of Boston's oldest and most distinguished families, Harvard Square and MIT professors, and the world renowned international lawyer and adviser to five Presidents, Grenville Clark. Mr. Byron observes to the Boston Redevelopment Administrator, a non-Bostonian, that:

> We have the curious notion that what happens to the buildings, neighborhoods and people of this city is as much our concern as yours.

In the past 2 years, Congress and the President have both expressed concern over the need to emphasize rehabilitation and preserve neighborhoods, and to construct more low-income housing and preserve present housing where it will serve this purpose. Mayor Collins of Boston has recognized, in part, this new approach in his decision to appoint a blue ribbon council to investigate a different developer and a different reuse for the area. In deciding to have the entire North Harvard Street urban renewal project area torn down first, however, he has unfortunately precluded the logical alternatives of rehabilitation and conservation of the neighborhood. I will await with interest to see if the Federal officials in New York and Washington live up to the spirit of the housing laws with respect to rehabilitation and conservation, or whether they will again fall back on legal technicalities in order to extricate themselves from a perilous political dilemma.

The irony of it all, if they take this course of inaction, will be that they will place themselves in an even more unfavorable position. There is already talk of forcing on to the ballot for November 1966 a proposal which would require a referendum for all urban renewal projects in Massachusetts. The national repercussions are obvious. As one who has contributed to the urban renewal laws, and cosponsored the last two major housing bills, I regret the need for this development. This grassroots reaction, however, is inevitable if the urban renewal program continues with its North Harvard Street-type projects.

I include a number of items, including the newspaper articles with the letters mentioned:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Aug. 22, 1965]

LETTERS FROM OUR READERS: LOGUE AND NORTH HARVARD STREET

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

There was one part of Jim Morse's excellent story on the North Harvard Street renewal project in last Sunday's Herald which truly shocked me. That was Development Administrator Logue's statement that despite his own doubts about the wisdom of this project, "I gave (it) my support because of the attitude of the people out there at the 1962 hearings." Is it an exaggeration to term this an outrageously irresponsible position for a public official to take? It appears that for Logue the question is not one of applying professional standards and devising the best possible project for the city, but one of taking punitive action against persons whose attitudes he does not like and following through on a 3-year-old grudge. The financial aids and landtaking powers bestowed by urban renewal represents a potentially useful tool; I seriously doubt whether the great powers given to whoever directs such a program ought to be in the hands of a man who uses them instead as a weapon. The message Logue wishes to give to other neighborhood groups in the city is clear: either behave yourself (i.e. do not seriously oppose what we are doing), or we'll sick the bulldozers on you.

It is possible too that this same punitive attitude toward the people of North Harvard Street is evident in the mayor's otherwise sensible suggestion that a "blue ribbon panel" be appointed to submit a new reuse plan as an alternative to the present plans to construct a high-rise luxury apartment house. For the mayor has indicated that the panel's role should be only to decide what reuse is made of the site after the land is cleared. But part of a reevaluation of this project must involve the basic question of whether the land should be cleared at all. How many of the present buildings can be saved, and is this a better course of action than total clearance? The sensible course of action is to leave open all present alternatives, including selective clearance, with new construction only on those lots which must be cleared.

Mr. Logue, in the Herald article, is quoted as calling the North Harvard Street protest an "effort to destroy the BRA." It is not. It is an effort to reorient the renewal program so as to make it more responsive to the needs of those people who need help the most. If the BRA is destroyed, it will be because Mr. Logue and others have been too inflexible to make the changes that the people and the times demand.

CHESTER W. HARTMAN.

CAMBRIDGE.

AUGUST 20, 1965.

Mr. EDWARD LOGUE,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. LOGUE: Enclosed please find copy of letter delivered to William Slayton by my wife who accompanied the busload of Allston residents to Washington, August 16, 1965.

Our little, growing, group of Cambridge "hard-core irresponsibles" already includes former Harvard overseer, world-renowned international lawyer and adviser to five U.S. Presidents, Grenville Clark (he has been paying the lion's share of Attorney William P. Homan's law fee all along), four or five members of some of Boston's oldest and most distinguished families, some Harvard Square businessmen and architects, a handful of Harvard and MIT professors. We are almost all Harvard graduates and property owners, all Democrats and liberals. Our age range is 35 to 80. We are all prourban renewal but against your totally outdated, bankrupt and undemocratic policies. You lost the people of this city some time ago; you lost the businessmen and realtors this summer; you are in process of losing the intellectuals. While the rest of the country has moved on to comprehensive neighborhood rehabilitation, while other planners have learned to plan with the people, all we hear from you is "relocation of 500 and 1,300 families."

We find Mayor Collins' "blue ribbon panel" a totally inadequate solution, as Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, has so aptly characterized it, to the problem of North Harvard Street since it will render its decision after the residents have been forced from their neighborhood. Our group will settle for nothing less than a rehabilitation plan for North Harvard Street that leaves all existing structures standing, returns titles to all remaining residents and uses the cleared land for low-income housing. If you should be foolish enough to recommence the demolition at North Harvard Street, and if you should by some miracle succeed in razing the neighborhood, then North Harvard Street is going to become a rallying cry that will, we predict, bind the BRA hand and foot within the tight confines of local referendums within 18 months. Some of us at least are prepared to work for such a project which, as you know, has already been launched.

We are sorry you think we are "outside agitators." Many of our families came to Boston over 300 years ago and we have the curious notion that what happens to the buildings, neighborhoods, and people of this city is as much our concern as yours. It is you in fact who is the outsider. Go back to your drawing boards and draw some plans that are acceptable to the neighborhoods of this city and perhaps then we shall be able to get on with the new Boston. The new Boston will not, repeat not, be forced down our throats with policemen's fists and billyclubs.

We shall see you at the sit-in at the next Allston eviction.

Yours truly,

DONALD C. BYRON,
Chairman, Cambridge Friends of North Harvard Street.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 14, 1965]

WEAVER REFUSES TO MEET WITH ALLSTON RENEWAL FOES

A delegation of urban renewal foes fighting the evictions in Allston lost out yesterday on an attempt to present their case in person to the Nation's top renewal director.

Dr. Robert Weaver, head of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency sent word he would not meet with the delegation which arrived yesterday in Washington, D.C.

"Tell them it's a local problem," Weaver said. "The vote was taken by the proper authorities in Boston.

"It would be unfair to them if I were to interject myself into what is evidently a local problem," he said.

The group had been attempting through Senator SALTONSTALL's office to arrange a Monday meeting with Dr. Weaver.

[From the Harvard Summer News, Aug. 19, 1965]

CONGRESSMEN RIDE TO RESCUE OF NORTH HARVARD RESIDENTS—O'NEILL CONVINCED E.M.K., SALTONSTALL

(By A. Douglas Matthews)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—They did it.

A busload of Allston residents who traveled to Washington to seek Federal intervention in their struggle to prevent the Boston Redevelopment Authority from razing their homes actually succeeded in prodding the glacial bureaucracy into movement. It wasn't easy and, as in all good success stories, there

were times when the outlook was exceedingly dim; but, to the amazement of almost everyone save themselves, the group left Washington with the assurances it had come to obtain.

What they wheedled was a statement from Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts. It asked Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner William Slayton to request that the Boston Redevelopment Authority halt evictions and demolitions. A two-man committee proposed by regional Urban Renewal Director Charles Horan could then inspect the situation and confer with the blue-ribbon committee proposed by Mayor John F. Collins to study renewal in the north Harvard area.

This would give the residents a stay of execution and permit them to try to stop the project by legislation or court action.

Their success is a tribute to persistence, a case study in democracy, a lesson in public relations and a minor miracle.

After arising and breakfasting at Washington's Greyhound bus terminal, the 40-member delegation chose a flagbearer and marched to the Housing and Home Finance Administration Building to seek an interview with its Administrator, Robert Weaver. Weaver had previously said that he wouldn't see the Allston delegation, but Slayton consented to give them a hearing. They were shown into the sixth-floor conference room.

"We'd better play it cool," observed one 12-year-old member.

"Look at me. I'm an executive," said Charlestown resident, Harold Nice, sitting at the head of the long, well-waxed conference table. Mrs. James B. Wheelis' 8-month-old son Eric began to whimper.

While Mrs. Marjorie Redgate, Herbert Brazo, and Stevan Goldin '64–4 spoke for the delegation, stating its case and asking that evictions and demolition be temporarily halted pending legislative and judicial processing, Slayton listened politely and took notes.

After Goldin had finished, Slayton noted that he "wanted to get on the record" that there had been public hearings on this matter and that there had been some illegal rent withholding on the residents' part. Goldin countered that the residents were using the only weapons at their disposal, then stood up, pounding on the table, pleading. "The point is that before the legislature can act the BRA is using terrorism." "Mr. Goldin, sit down," said Slayton, his smile fading. "You've made your point and I've recorded it here," he said, pointing to his pad.

Slayton later asked the four delegates from Charlestown, another Boston suburb that is due for renewal soon, if they wanted a hearing.

They agreed, but ended by stalking out of the room in a rage 10 minutes later.

The group then decided to picket the building, but half of its members balked when they saw a policeman arrive. This half, including the Charlestown contingent and other non-Allston supporters, later stalked out of SALTONSTALL's office, scratching their names from the guest book. Meanwhile the other half stayed to picket for about an hour, then decided to go over to the Capitol to see Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, perhaps the House's leading expert on housing.

Goldin's group, now totaling seven, discovered that the first group had seen SALTONSTALL and were now in O'NEILL's office arguing against renewal in Charlestown. They rushed down, managed with some difficulty to get the floor, and began to plead their own case.

O'NEILL listened, but then explained "My heart goes out to the people of North Harvard, but I can't get into every backyard squabble." He said that Slayton really had no jurisdiction over Logue. Goldin maintained that WIDNALL had said that Slayton did have power because Logue would have to come to him for future Federal funds.

O'NEILL agreed to check on this point with WIDNALL on the House floor.

The Charlestown group, consistent as Old Faithful, then got into a heated discussion with O'NEILL and ended by stomping out yelling insults while the Allston residents remained with the annoyed Representative.

When O'NEILL left, some of the group stayed in his office. Others went to sit under a tree, and still others went to Senator KENNEDY's office to plead their case. Senator KENNEDY was absent, but the group presented its case to Charles Trettor, an administrative assistant. The discussion was interrupted by a call from the Senator, who explained that he had just been contacted by O'NEILL and that a joint statement was being written. Trettor explained the development to the pilgrims, who profusely expressed their gratitude and decided to reunite under the tree. "I admire their grit," said Trettor, originally from Allston himself.

About a half an hour later, the reunited group was headed for dinner, dehydrated but delighted, their faith in democracy restored.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 17, 1965]

KENNEDY, SALTONSTALL URGE ALLSTON PROBE: ASK HALT TO EVICTIONS

(By Joseph T. Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—Three leaders of the Massachusetts congressional delegation urged Monday afternoon that evictions and demolitions be stopped in the North Harvard Street urban renewal area until Federal officials make a complete probe of the controversial project.

DAY-LONG SERIES OF PROTESTS

A joint statement to this effect was released by Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Cambridge, following a day-long series of protests here by a delegation of 40 residents of the Allston district.

After the residents met with Senator SALTONSTALL in his office, the Senator said he thought they had a "damned meritorious case."

The delegation said its feelings would be made known to Boston Redevelopment Administrator Edward J. Logue by Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton immediately.

TO SEND INSPECTORS

Earlier, following a meeting with the protesters, Slayton said he would send personal representatives to Boston to inspect the situation.

The statement from KENNEDY, SALTONSTALL, and O'NEILL read:

"In view of Mayor Collins' appointment of a blue ribbon commission to study the North Harvard Street problem we are seeking William Slayton to immediately stop evictions and demolitions until the two men, Urban Renewal Regional Director Charles Horan has agreed to send to Boston, can talk it over with the blue ribbon commission."

Mayor Collins announced last Thursday that he would appoint such a commission in the wake of demonstrations in the area at which several residents were arrested for refusing eviction. Members of the commission have not yet been named.

At that time he also ordered a temporary stop to the evictions and demolitions.

CHILDREN IN DELEGATION

The delegation, including children, came here by bus and spokesmen said all have received eviction notices ordering them to move from the 6-acre tract part of which has already been demolished to make way for a luxury apartment complex.

Earlier, at an hour-long meeting in his office, Representative O'NEILL told the group their only recourse was "persuasion."

Steven Goldin, a Harvard senior who lives in the area, and organizer of the group, said residents are "living in real terror there."

He charged that the Boston Redevelopment Authority has never listened to the group. "They ignored everything we ever tried to say to them," he maintained. "You don't destroy good low-rent neighborhoods."

O'NEILL told him, "I can't get involved in every backyard squabble," and that the final decision would have to come from Logue.

"It's impossible to get embroiled in this matter at this stage," O'NEILL added. "But what can I do for you?"

He agreed with Goldin, he said, that the neighborhood was "basically a good one," and said he had personally visited it over the past weekend.

PICKET BUILDING

After the session, he telephoned KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL on the protesters' behalf. He also telephoned Slayton.

The group left Boston by bus Sunday at 11 p.m. and arrived here at 9:30 a.m. They spent the morning at the offices of the Urban Renewal Administration in a heated, emotional session and afterwards picketed the building near the Nation's Capitol.

It was the hottest day of the year for the city as temperatures approached 100 degrees.

The group told Slayton at the session he had 1 hour to investigate and come up with an answer. Otherwise, members would take further action.

"We consider this an emergency situation," Goldin said:

After Horan said he would send representatives to Boston, he added: "I don't think I can make another commitment further than that."

One woman said: "I can't afford to pay high rents. I have a nice decent home and can afford to live in it. But I can't afford anything else."

They also protested that Mayor Collins planned to have the Blue Ribbon commission restudy the situation with an eye toward the possibility of low-rent construction but only after the entire area had been cleared.

After meeting with O'NEILL the group spent about 3 minutes with Senator SALTONSTALL in the latter's office during which he again said they shouldn't have come to Washington because they were unable to get a personal hearing with Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert Weaver.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Aug. 20, 1965]

THE POLITICAL CIRCUIT: URBAN RENEWAL BALLOT—BOUND

(By S. J. Micciche)

Urban renewal is likely to become a hot political issue across the State in next year's election.

And to some degree the prospect may explain the slowdown by the Boston Redevelopment Authority toward the North Harvard Street project in Brighton.

An initiative petition that could put urban renewal on the 1966 ballot as a referendum question was approved as to form and subject matter this week by Attorney General Brooke.

The petition would impose plebiscite approval by the property owners and tenants of a proposed renewal area as a requirement before any project can be undertaken.

The antirenewal forces must obtain about 72,000 signatures, amounting to 3 percent of the vote cast for Governor in the 1964 election, to put the petition before the legislature in January.

If the legislature defeats the proposal, proponents must obtain an additional 11,000 signatures to make a ballot issue.

The legislature earlier this year rejected the idea of voting in connection with urban renewal projects and there's little likelihood this sentiment would change since the same members will be coming back for the 1966 session.

In effect, the plebiscite could virtually block all urban renewal.

Under the petition, no area can be designated for a renewal project unless it is approved by two-thirds of the property owners and tenants voting or a majority of those qualified by residence and ownership to vote.

Further, if the project is so approved, no changes in the plans can be made unless similarly assented to by another vote.

Also, each tenant and property owner must be supplied a copy of the renewal plan and three public hearings must be held prior to the voting.

No funds may be spent beyond the preparation of the plans going to inhabitants of the proposed renewal area and for the public hearings. Specifically, the petition prohibits the taking of any property until the project is approved by the area's property owners and tenants.

Among the 10 signers of the initiative petition are Boston City Councilor Katherine Craven, of Hyde Park, and Representative Thomas F. Farrell, Democrat, of Worcester.

Simultaneously with the filing of the initiative petition, antirenewal proponents submitted legislation seeking an investigation on urban renewal spending.

Legislative approval of such a probe could give impetus to the signature drive for the initiative petition.

An urban renewal referendum on the 1966 ballot could rebound on to the candidates. If it is a ballot question, it would certainly put the major candidates on the spot for an opinion.

The heat now generated locally, particularly in Boston, could conceivably mushroom across the State and become a central campaign issue.

Mayor Collins, with aspirations for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate, could be hurt within his own city if urban renewal supersedes foreign policy and domestic affairs as the overriding issue for that lofty position.

Though he has not been directly involved in each of the renewal projects, Collins did hire Boston Redevelopment Authority's Edward Logue and he has defended his policies.

Logue is the target for antirenewal venom in Boston. In a campaign, it would be difficult to insulate Collins from it.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 6, 1965]

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KICKS OUT HARVARD SOCCER FIELD: ALLSTON PROJECT TAKEN OVER FOR URBAN RENEWAL

(By W. J. McCarthy)

The Boston Redevelopment Authority said yesterday that it had undertaken its controversial North Harvard project in Allston to stop Harvard University from buying up property in the area and making it a soccer field.

Effort by deputy sheriffs to evict four families from the project area precipitated a melee Tuesday and the arrest of four young men who are now free on $50 bail each, pending disposition of breach-of-the-peace charges.

Last night, the North Harvard Neighborhood Association sent telegrams to President Johnson and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY protesting the Boston Redevelopment Authority evictions.

The telegram to the White House called upon Johnson "to keep your promise of a decent home for every American family and direct Mayor Collins to stop the reign of terror on North Harvard Street."

The group called upon KENNEDY to use his influence to stop "a monument to human cruelty" only a few hundred yards from the site of the Kennedy Memorial Library.

In a 3-page press release issued yesterday, the Boston Redevelopment Authority said the evictions had been ordered against those tenants in the project area "who flatly and for no valid reason refused to pay their rents."

One of those facing eviction, and one of those arrested Tuesday, James G. Wheelis of 4 Hefferan Street, said it was his recollection that the eviction notice had specified "noncooperation" as the reason.

Wheelis said that he had not paid any rent since November, "but I'm quite sure the notice didn't say for nonpayment of rent. It was for noncooperation, for not going down in their relocation office, and things like that."

PACKED AWAY

He said that he had the notice, "but it's probably packed away in one of the barrels."

Wheelis said he expected that he and his wife and their 8-month-old son, Erik, would be "forcefully evicted," and that he had made arrangements for temporary quarters.

He indicated that he would put up no more resistance when the sheriff's men come back.

"I'm personally not swinging under any more trucks" said Wheelis.

Wheelis and three others, David Outerbridge, 28, of 31 Field Street, Roxbury, Stevan Goldin, 23, of 9 Hefferan Street, and Bernard Redgate, 24, of 162 North Harvard Street, are free in $50 bail each on charges of breach of the peace. Their cases will be heard August 12 in Brighton District Court.

John F. McMorrow, director of administrative management for the BRA, said that he wasn't sure of the precise reason for the eviction notices, but hazarded the guess that if they did read "noncooperation" it would be for technical or legal reasons.

It was impossible to obtain further clarification at the BRA legal office. John C. Conley, counsel, was on vacation, and Thomas F. Hanley, assistant counsel, was, according to a secretary, "unavailable. He's in the board room."

LATER DEADLINE

Edward M. Logue, BRA administrator, said Tuesday that those tenants in the project area who have paid their rents have until September 1 to move out.

The BRA statement gave this as the history of the project:

"In most of the projects it is undertaking the Redevelopment Authority is endeavoring to renew and rehabilitate existing neighborhoods.

"The North Harvard project, however, does not fall in that category because the property within the project area was being purchased by Harvard University for conversion into a soccer field and was scheduled to go off the city"s tax rolls. At the time the authority took the North Harvard property, 40 percent of it was owned by Harvard.

"The redevelopment authority felt it would be in the public interest to keep the property on the tax roles, and an apartment building containing middle-income housing is planned.

"A separate project of moderately priced relocation housing will also be constructed nearby."

The statement continued that if BRA actions were "to be determined by irresponsible pickets and demonstrators, by vilification and cursing, by shouting and shoving, then there will be no New Boston."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Aug. 7, 1965]

SOCCER FIELD PLANS DENIED

(By W. J. McCarthy)

A spokesman for Harvard University described as "absolutely false" yesterday an assertion by the Boston Redevelopment Authority that the institution was buying property in the North Harvard area of Allston for conversion to a tax-exempt soccer field.

"We have been buying property in the area, as it became available," said W. H. Stiles of the Harvard News Office, "but for possible expansion of the business school. There was also thought given to it as a possible site for the Kennedy Memorial Library, but not as a soccer field."

OUT OF MARKET

Stiles said that Harvard withdrew from the market in 1961, when it first heard of plans by the BRA to take over the area for development as a site for high-rise and middle-income apartments.

Another Harvard official, in a conversation with a representative of the North Harvard Neighborhood Association, was quoted as saying that the university was repeating now an offer made last year to redevelop the area itself "to provide relief from the critical shortage of low-cost housing."

Efforts by deputy sheriffs, acting on warrants issued by the BRA, to evict four families from the project area touched off a wild melee Tuesday. Four men who tried to stop the evictions were arrested and are now free in bail of $50 each on charges of breach of the peace.

Yesterday one of the four, Stevan Goldin, 23, of 9 Hefferan Street, talked with Charles Whitlock, special assistant to President Nathan M. Pusey, of Harvard, and quoted Whitlock as saying that the soccer field report was "untrue."

The Neighborhood Association promptly branded the BRA's defense of the project as "a complete fraud." The association charged the BRA with engaging in "a crusade against soccer fields to hide the ugly truth that the residents were only to be evicted because they have the misfortune of being poor people living on valuable real estate wanted by influential developers for luxury apartment houses."

SEEMS INCONSISTENT

The association then went on to dispute an assertion by the BRA that it had undertaken the North Harvard project in order to keep the property on the tax rolls of the city.

But they directed their fire in this instance at Edward M. Logue, BRA administrator.

"Ed Logue's concern about Harvard's possible expansion seems inconsistent," said an association statement, "with the fact that last month the BRA voted to seize taxpaying land and give it to Tufts Medical School in the South Cove project."

Another of the four men arrested, James G. Wheelis, 23, of 4 Hefferan Street, offered yesterday to pay the rent on his apartment back to last November, on condition that the authority call a halt to the eviction proceedings.

His offer was rejected by Joseph Buckman, project director, with the statement:

"The BRA will accept the money but doesn't waive its right, as stated in the notice to vacate you received in May 1965."

Wheelis, who owes $414, put away his checkbook and kept his prepared statement, which read:

"I, James Wheelis, agree to pay all my back and future rent to the BRA on condition that they will desist hereafter from evicting all residents, both homeowners and tenants, if they have paid their rent."

Not long afterward the BRA issued a statement which questioned Wheelis' motives in the entire controversy, and which repeated the assertion that Harvard planned to use the area for soccer.

"Mr. Wheelis," said the BRA statement, "is a student at Harvard University. It would be interesting to know if he would have refused to pay his rent if Harvard University had taken this property, as it started to do, for use as the site of a soccer field."

Regarding the university's position, Goldin quoted Whitlock as saying that it was prepared to demolish any unsound buildings and repair those remaining so that it could continue to lease apartments to students and Allston families, to provide relief from the critical shortage of low-cost housing."

Whitlock was further quoted as saying: "Harvard will continue to pay taxes on these buildings."

Logue, meanwhile, told reporter that evictions in the project would resume next week.

BARRIERS LIKELY

"More people will be moved out next week," he said. "Let them keep their picket lines. I don't care. The sheriffs and police will deal quickly with those who defy the law."

Logue said there was "a likelihood that barriers will be used" if outsiders come in to lend assistance to the embattled tenants and householders.

In two other developments, efforts were made at the city and State level to stop the evictions.

At city hall, Councilman Christopher A. Iannella, who voted against the project when it passed the city council by a 5-to-4 vote 3 years ago, terms the project "a sad exception" to an urban renewal programs that was good overall.

He called upon Mayor Collins to modify the project "so that it will be in the interests of the residents rather than the real estate developers."

At the State House, Senator Beryl Cohen, Democrat, of Brookline, filed a bill to require that the takings be stopped unless provision is made:

For conservation and rehabilitation of the project area.

For installation of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds.

For reconveyance to former owners of property taken by eminent domain.

For participation by the people involved in preparation of a modified plan.

For approval of such plans by individuals and families.

Cohen said that he had help in preparing the legislation from Attorney William Homas of Cambridge, who is council for the residents of the neighborhood.

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Aug. 15, 1965]

NORTH HARVARD STREET BATTLES THE BRA—THE STORY BEHIND THE EVICTION DISPUTE AS BESIEGED ALLSTON RESIDENTS AND URBAN RENEWAL BOSS EDWARD LOGUE SEE IT

(By Jim Morse)

It was one of those summer mornings when the air was warm and sticky shortly after daybreak. On Hefferan Street in Allston, tempers—like the temperature—became increasingly hot as breakfast dishes were piled in the sink and the morning progressed.

This was the day when Harvard student James Wheelis, his wife and infant son were scheduled to be evicted from their apartment to make room for an urban renewal project in a 6-acre tract bordering North Harvard Street and Western Avenue.

It was to be a day of protest. A day of battle.

Residents of the area had been opposing the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) renewal plans for 4 years and they had been joined by sympathizers from throughout Boston and its suburbs.

There had already been a skirmish with police. Four men had been arrested the week before when another Harvard student was evicted. But this was to be a day of major protest. It was Monday, August 9, 1965.

Early in the morning at 168 North Harvard Street Mrs. Anne Soricelli prayed before a statue of the Virgin Mary which she had placed on a table in front of her home. She was joined by several neighbors.

Mrs. Soricelli, who is 75, has lived at 168 North Harvard Street for 57 years. "This home has been my life," she says. "My husband was sick for 23 years before he died and I had to work to support the family. I was a machine operator in a silk factory. Sometimes all I got was $8 a week.

"I worked and I paid for this place and now they tell me to say goodbye. I don't want to say goodbye. This is my home."

Next door, at the Ready Luncheonette, Albert Redgate and his wife, Marjorie, prepared for the day. The Redgates operate the luncheonette, which has become the unofficial anti-BRA headquarters. Mrs. Redgate has been leading the fight since March of 1961 when, she says, "they told us they were going to come in and take over."

The Redgates didn't know it, but before this day was over they would both be arrested.

On Hefferan Street, which, with Hefferan Drive forms a triange with Western Avenue at the rear of the Harvard Business School, Mr. and Mrs. Wheelis didn't know what to expect.

Their apartment was the BRA's target for the day.

In Boston, Edward J. Logue, the BRA administrator, wasn't pleased about what would happen before nightfall.

Logue has frequently said that the Allston project "isn't one of my favorites," but he had a job to do and he was determined to do it.

Meanwhile, back in the North Harvard Street area, the excitement was beginning.

Residents and outsiders moved old cars into the two entrances of Hefferan Street in an attempt to block passage. Crowds began collecting, and people stood in front of the Wheelis home talking and waiting. There was still no sign of the police.

Not far away, however, on Smith Street, bulldozers moved into the project area and, while jeering spectators looked on, they took less than 10 minutes to demolish a house. It was the first dwelling to be leveled.

The noise and the sight of the debris left by the bulldozers served as a torch to already broiling tempers. There was a mood of defiance.

Shortly after 1 p.m. police, deputy sheriffs, and a BRA-hired moving van arrived on the scene.

Tow trucks were used to remove the autos blocking the street, and the van was driven to the front of the three-decker house in which the Wheelis family occupied an apartment.

Violence threatened to break out at any moment.

The crowd of several hundred urban renewal foes shouted and sang "freedom" songs.

Men and women screamed at the police. Tomatoes were thrown.

The steps leading to the building were packed with sympathizers who refused to let police go through. These people were orderly, however.

They were led by Stevan Goldin, 23, a Harvard student who, on August 3, became the first project resident to the evicted. Golden urged the crowd not to become violent.

"Don't fight when the police move in," he pleaded. "They don't want to do this. It's their job. Just sit and don't move. Lock your arms and legs. Mayor Collins and Logue are to blame, not the police."

Mrs. Wheelis, holding her 8-month-old son, Eric, in her arms, was standing at the front door when deputies and police began clearing the steps and porch. Mrs. Marjorie Rhoads, a friend, was with her, and when they saw what was happening, the two women slipped back inside the door.

Two women deputies entered the house and escorted Mrs. Wheelis and Mrs. Rhoads outside.

"One of them took the baby from me," Mrs. Wheelis told the crowd. "I had to come out. They had my baby."

Once the porch was cleared, movers went into the apartment and began bringing out the furniture while Mrs. Wheelis sat on the sidewalk across the street and cried.

When the affair was over, 12 persons were under arrest, 10 of them on charges of trespassing. Mrs. Redgate was charged with assault and battery for allegedly striking an arresting policeman and her husband was charged with attempting to rescue a prisoner under arrest, his wife.

The 12 were taken to Brighton district court, where Judge Charles J. Artesani gave them a tongue lashing and continued their cases to August 18. Bail ranged from $50 to $2,000.

The BRA had won the battle to evict the Wheelis family, but Mrs. Redgate and her followers still believe they will win the war.

Several hours after the Wheelis apartment had been emptied and news of the incident began to spread about the city, the legislature and city council took action.

State Senator Beryl W. Cohen, Democrat, of Brookline, filed an emergency bill to modify the North Harvard renewal plan. The bill would reconvey property taken by the BRA back to original owners and provide for rehabilitation and conservation of the area.

The city council followed this move by voting to ask the BRA to halt further evictions until the legislature acts on Senator Cohen's bill.

During the same meeting, the council turned down, by a 7-to-1 vote, a motion by Councilwoman Katherine Craven asking the BRA to "summarily dismiss" Logue.

Mrs. Craven is one of the more outspoken critics of Logue.

"He couldn't care less about the defenseless people of the city," she said the other day. "He takes advantage of them. I won't stand for it." She paused, then added: "I won't sit for it, either."

Logue is used to criticism and claims it doesn't bother him.

"My mother used to have a happy phrase," he says. "'Consider the source.' When Mrs. Craven speaks, for example, I don't hear her."

On Tuesday, Logue ordered the evictions to be continued.

"I'm merely carrying out the instructions of the BRA," he said. He called Senator Cohen's action "very shortsighted" and expressed the hope the legislature would not interfere with the renewal plans for Allston.

The following day, however, there was an interesting development.

Logue said he would order no more evictions until after the next BRA meeting, scheduled August 19. He said he had taken this step because "cooperation has improved considerably."

Mrs. Redgate wonders who is cooperating.

"We're not cooperating," she says. "We still want our homes."

Following Logue's decision to delay evictions, Mayor Collins—who had been a strong supporter of the BRA's Allston project—issued a statement urging the BRA to reconsider its plans.

It has been reported for 2 years that a 10-story, $7 million luxury apartment would be constructed on the renewal site. Rentals, it was said, would range from $175 to $290 a month. Present rentals in the area are from $40 to $80.

On Thursday, however, Mayor Collins suggested construction of low-rent housing instead of luxury apartments. He also proposed creation of a "blue ribbon panel" to recommend the best use of the land and to select a developer.

This didn't make the people of North Harvard Street any happier.

Attorney William Homans, Jr., who represents many of the residents involved, told the Sunday Herald: "They are gratified that some change is being made, but Mayor Collins' recommendation doesn't do them any good. The people are still to be evicted and the area is still to be cleared.

"The only real change is that it appears there is no longer a commitment to any particular developer."

Mrs. Redgate agrees.

"They're all hypocrites," she says. "Collins, Logue and the rest of them. I'll go to jail before I give in to the BRA. What is the BRA doing for us? Nothing. Just tearing down our homes."

From the outset 4 years ago, the proposed urban renewal project in Allston has encountered stiff opposition.

The plan was officially approved by the BRA in the late summer of 1962 and by the city council on December 28 of that year. It was not until last November, however, that actual landtaking began.

In 1962 a large sign appeared outside the Redgates' luncheonette. It is still there and it says, in part: "To Hell with Urban Renewal. It is Legalized Theft of Private Property. We Shall Defend Our Homes with Our Lives."

Three days ago another sign appeared: "Mayor Collins—Stop Power Politics."

The fight has been long and bitter.

In 1962, at a public hearing held in Allston's Gardner School, BRA board members were jeered and shouted down by a foot-stomping crowd. In December of 1962, Mayor Collins' home in Jamaica Plain was picketed by Allston residents when he gave approval to the project.

That public hearing, incidentally, is one of the reasons for Logue's determination to see the Allston renewal plans carried out.

"I gave this project my support because of the attitude of the people out there at the 1962 public hearing," he says. "If the Authority had been persuaded to drop the project by that kind of demonstration, it might as well have gone out of business right then and there.

"There was violent abuse at that hearing. If this abuse had been allowed to sway the decision, it would have led to more abuse."

Since the BRA began taking over properties in the project area last November, several of the residents, as a method of protest, have refused to pay their rents. These are the ones who have received eviction notices.

Wheelis, for one, did not pay his rent. He was given notice to vacate his Hefferan Street apartment last May. Early this month he offered to pay his back rent, provided the BRA would desist from evicting all residents, both homeowners and tenants, if they, too, paid their rent. The BRA refused his offer.

A group known as the North Harvard Neighborhood Association sent telegrams to President Johnson and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY urging them to "stop the reign of terror in this embattled area."

Evictions in the area were opposed by the League of Women Voters, the Massachusetts Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, and several city planners.

Four young men were arrested August 3 when Harvard senior, Stevan Goldin, was evicted from his Hefferan Street apartment. Goldin was one of the four whom police accused of disturbing the peace. The others were Wheelis, Bernard Redgate, a teacher at Xaviarian Brothers School in Westwood, and David Outerbridge of Roxbury.

When they appeared in Brighton District Court last week, Judge Artesani continued their cases for 2 months and said they would be dropped if there is no further trouble.

The four were arrested after they attempted to block a moving truck attempting to leave the area with Goldin's furniture. They were dragged from beneath the truck by police and carried to a patrol wagon.

The names Wheelis, Goldin, and Redgate appear frequently in the Allston proceedings. They are spearheading the fight.

Wheelis admits that his participation in the battle is interfering with his studies at Harvard. "I was taking two math courses this summer," he says, "and I had to drop one."

Why did he become involved?

"Because the injustice is so great," he says. "Anything I can do to help remedy the situation will seem worthwhile."

Wheelis denies that "any political types" are aiding the urban renewal opponents in Allston.

"'No political groups are officially participating," he says, "and I do not know of any of the volunteers who are politically motivated. There is enough injustice here to go around without political aims."

Stevan Goldin joined the fight, he says, "because Mrs. Redgate deserved some help. She has held the opposition together for years. She is a woman of amazing courage."

This is not Goldin's first experience as an urban renewal foe. When he was living on the Lower East Side of New York City, he actively opposed a similar project there. "We were trying to save our neighborhood," he says, "just as these people in Allston are trying to save their homes."

Why is he so strongly opposed?

"All this project is doing," he says, "is throwing poor people out of their homes for the benefit of a few wealthy individuals. This is a closely knit neighborhood. The people like each other and want to stay together."

Another big name is the continuing battle, the "general" for the BRA, is Logue.

In his opinion, the area involved is not suitable for rehabilitation.

"I do not know what all the shouting is about," he says. "In Roxbury we have moved 1,200 families from substandard to standard housing, and there has been no fuss.

"I understand that Goldin is moving to Roxbury and that he plans to fight the proposed innerbelt highways through that section of the city. He will find little sympathy there. He is an immature kid. I am surprised that he can continue at Harvard. I am surprised he was adimtted there in the first place."

Logue says that of the 62 families who were living in the Allston project area when urban renewal plans were announced, 34 remain. "Of the 34, 16 have been paying their rent right along," he adds.

"There is a lot more to the new Boston than 6 acres of land in back of the Harvard Business School," Logue says. "This effort to destroy the BRA will fail.

"Big cities always invite expression of free speech. People don't usually talk up in the suburbs. They come here. Boston, like other big cities, is a target area for demonstrations. I think that's what is going on in Allston."

Logue says he has no evidence that the John Birch Society, which has been campaigning against urban renewal on a national level, is engaged in the Allston rhubarb.

"I don't take the Birch Society very seriously," he says.

Although he has delayed further evictions, Logue says that bulldozers will continue to be busy in Allston.

"We're going to keep on demolishing already emptied buildings," he says.

And the Allston renewal foes are also continuing their efforts.

Tomorrow a delegation of North Harvard Street residents will be in Washington, D.C., to confer with Housing and Home Administrator Robert Weaver.

The trip is being financed by contributions from the neighborhood.

[From the Boston Herald]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY—OR A LIBERAL RECANTS

Some of us who have been liberals and Democrats all our lives, and have backed the Federal urban renewal program because it seemed to bring a ray of hope to slum dwellers, are now having second thoughts. Too often what starts out to be a program to help the poor, ends up by being a kind of nightmare, blitzkrieg warfare against them and their way of life, a foredoomed attempt to inflict middle-class values on those who do not want them. Urban renewal has built about 2 low-cost housing units for each 10 it destroyed; the majority of relocatees are forced to pay higher rents for similar units in similar neighborhoods. It would appear that urban renewal does not destroy slums but sweeps them instead from one corner of the city to another, that it does not decrease crime or perversion or alcoholism or drug addiction but moves them instead around the corner. Better housing may have an effect on slum mentality but if it does it probably comes at the end of a long list that starts with better schools, better courts, more and better social, medical, and employment services. Hope, to the best of our knowledge, does not come to the poor in the form of a bulldozer—anyone who believes it does should get out and try talking to the poor.

As well as destroying countless thousands of low-cost dwelling units, urban renewal appears to be a destroyer of one of this country's rarest and most precious possessions—neighborhoods—those living, viable sociological entities that bind man to man and bring a degree of comfort to those who know few other comforts. If the present program is doubled or tripled as Washington now plans, and if it is left in the hands of renewal directors such as Edward Logue, this country is in danger of creating a pool of from 10 to 20 million bitter, disaffected people at the bottom of the social heap who look on their governments as their deadly enemy.

What then of the dying city, what of the tax base, of the flight of the middle classes? We do not deny any of these problems and they would not go away if we did. We stanchly maintain we are not antiurban renewal. We submit however, that a program that turns the poor against their Government, that brings a 25 to 40 percent casualty rate to displaced businesses, that does such violence to our basic property rights, that produces hesitancy and uncertainty among real estate investors, and that is fraught with unprecedented possibilities for personal and political graft—such a program must be radically altered.

Something, of course, has to be done, some Federal money is necessary, the program has, on balance, helped Boston. But the days of the hard-nosed, hard-driving prima donna renewal directors are over—dead, gone, finished. We need a whole new breed of planners, sensitive, democratic, cooperative, willing to plan with the people of the poorest sections and with the real estate investors who are, after all, responsible for 95 percent or more of all the actual construction and reconstruction that is completed each year in the United States. Sensitive men, with humility, unconcerned with personal fame or ambition, willing to take 15 or even 20 years to bring about changes that are now rushed through in 5 of 6 years at such terrible cost—human, financial, and sociological.

Many of us are wondering now about this entity initialed BRA, this vast seemingly uncontrollable authority that our naive liberal confidence in Federal good will has

implanted here in our midst. We like not the feel of this State within the State, of all these nonelected officials running around with so many millions of our tax dollars, of this abuse of the power of eminent domain, of this arbitrary setting of so-called fair-market value, of actions like the hiring of 125 policemen (at a cost of about $3,000 of our money) for one evening's hearing in South Boston. We feel the time is now to cut back rather than expand this program, to submit this authority to the closest possible scrutiny, to curb and democratize its powers, possibly to put it within the confines of the local referendum system. The all-American city is not quite American enough for us.

DONALD C. BYRON,
Chairman, Cambridge Friends of North Harvard Street.

HOME RULE: CULTURE AND RECREATION IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration by this House of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 on September 15, I offered an amendment which provided that in the case of the District of Columbia the Recreation Board shall be the State agency. The amendment was accepted by the very able chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], who, incidentally, and more than incidentally, as I said at the time, has demonstrated outstanding dedication and performance on this bill and other bills pertaining to the arts over a period of years. He is an acknowledged expert in the arts field and is extremely interested in the welfare of the arts.

Considerable interest has been expressed in my amendment, and the Washington Post recently carried an editorial critical of the amendment I offered. I include the following informational material in explanation of the amendment which has now been accepted by both the House and Senate without debate, and is now a firm part of the act which is before the President for his approval.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 23977, Sept. 15, 1965]

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: On page 9, line 20, after 'plan' insert the following: 'except that in the case of the District of Columbia the Recreation Board shall be the State agency.' "

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman has discussed this amendment with me, and I have discussed it. We are prepared to accept it. In the District of Columbia currently the Recreation Board does receive funds for such activities. We will be delighted to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, while the bill was being read for amendment, I offered an amendment which provided that on page 9, line 20, after "plan" insert the following: ", except that in the case of the District of Columbia the Recreation Board shall be the 'State agency'." This amendment was accepted by the chairman [Mr. THOMPSON] without debate.

This amendment recognized the longtime place of the District Recreation Board in having responsibility over the recreational and art programs of the District of Columbia. Congress in 1942 authorized such jurisdiction for the District of Columbia Recreation Department. Through the years the Recreation Board has been commended for its fine performance and I fully believe that it has the support of all the District citizens whom it has served so well and impartially throughout the years, as well as the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Civic Opera Association, and other cultural groups and organizations.

At the present time, Congress is now appropriating nearly $5 million per year to the District Recreation Department to carry on all of the District's recreation and art activities. The adoption of the amendment will insure that the District of Columbia Recreation Department will be protected by the Congress and the District government in future legislation brought before the Congress, including the home rule bill. Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, presently and for a long time superintendent of the Recreation Department, Joseph H. Cole, the assistant superintendent, and the board chairman, William H. Waters, Jr., deserve great credit for the work that has been done and the programs accomplished during their tenure in office.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM H. WATERS, Jr.,
Chairman, Recreation Board of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WATERS: As you know, the House amended the bill creating a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities by specifying that the District of Columbia Recreation Department will be the state agency for administering the program in the District of Columbia.

Because of your long association with cultural activities in the District, I was, of course, happy to accept the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. WIDNALL. I am aware, however, that in the minds of a great many people "recreation" is associated with playgrounds and allied activities. I therefore think it might be advisable if you were to consider having an Advisory Committee of distinguished citizens of the District who are associated with or are themselves creative or performing artists. I believe that such a committee could have the same relationship with you as the widespread Citizens Advisory Council has with the Board of Commissioners, and would be a good public relations move by you.

Kind regards.

Cordially yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

Copies to: Mr. Livingston Biddle, and Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 19, 1965]

CULTURE AND RECREATION

In a well-motivated but unfortunate amendment to the bill creating a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, Representative WIDNALL succeeded in having the District Recreation Board named as the agency to supervise Foundation programs in Washington. With no reflection on the energetic activities of the Recreation Board, there are two objections to this legislative prescription for handling the $50,000 grant to which Washington will become entitled.

First, although several cultural programs have been funded through the Board, the vast majority of its work has been in the recreation field. Second, the stipulation of the Recreation Board as the agent implies that the Board should have an independent or autonomous existence under home rule. This ought not to be the case. An advisory council of citizens and community organizations including arts groups, will be needed to frame the cultural program in any event. Let it be created under an elected city government.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1965.

Re home rule—culture and recreation in the the Nation's Capital—an open letter.

The EDITOR,
WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, "Culture and Recreation" (Sept. 19), raises a number of interesting points to which, in view of the imminence of home rule for District citizens, early and objective answers should be sought. As you know, I have long advocated home rule for the District, and I signed the current discharge petition. I am also deeply interested in the arts, and believe that under home rule they will burgeon here as they are doing all over the country at this time.

On many occasions the Post has called for steps to preserve freedom of the arts, a basic and essential freedom. Congress itself has long recognized the importance of freedom of the arts from domination and control from whatever source, and has placed the Federal art institutions—the National Gallery of Art, the Freer Gallery, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the National Portrait Gallery, and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—in the Smithsonian Institution, "a quasi-public, quasi-private entity,"—where they can be fully nurtured and protected, as far as humanly possible, from unwise and dominating influences and pressures. Since the Smithsonian Institution and its art institutions are being zealously maintained and protected under home rule by the Congress, it seems equally reasonable and desirable to zealously maintain and protect the District's "independent or autonomous" art agency: the District of Columbia Recreation Board, under home rule.

The contribution to the arts of the District of Columbia Recreation Board is amazingly large and of very high standards, despite the pitifully small budget furnished the Board by the Congress and the District Commissioners in recent years. Currently it is under $50,000, whereas other cities the size of Washington spend $500,000 to $1 million on their own local art programs. Programs sponsored and financially aided by the Board include the annual art fair in the President's Park south of the White House which is cosponsored by the Post. One hundred and forty-eight thousand people attended the fair this year, and hundreds of artists participated and had their works displayed. President and Mrs. Johnson have attended this fair, as has other notables. President Johnson has purchased some of the works of art. Mrs. Johnson opened the program last year. The National Symphony Orchestra provides free concerts for the funds provided it, and free performances are likewise presented by such sponsored and financially aided groups as the Shakespeare Summer

Festival, the Washington Civic Opera Association, the Children's Theater, the One-Act Play Tournament, the Watergate Concerts, etc. Some of these programs are so highly regarded that they have been presented under the patronage of the Ambassadors of France, Austria, Germany, Italy, and other countries.

While he was a Senator, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY introduced legislation to deposit in a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia Recreation Board 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the District government. These funds were to be available to the Board to defray in part the expense of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District.

In his introductory speech Vice President HUMPHREY said that "Unfortunately, all too little has been done to promote the arts in the Nation's Capital * * *. Washington's budget has allotted for civic events only $16,000." He included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a study by the Library of Congress showing that other cities in our country, large and small, provided many times as much financial aid to their local art institutions and programs as Washington does. The Post editorially supported the concept of this bill offered by Senator HUMPHREY and his colleagues.

While President John F. Kennedy was in the Senate he introduced a bill to establish a municipal arts center to be managed with the advice of the District of Columbia Recreation Board and Department. Such an arts center could have prepared the District's own art groups and young artists for presentation at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The overconcentration on sports by the District of Columbia Recreation Board, of which the Post complains, is due, primarily, to such things as (a) congressional failure to adopt the significant proposals initiated by Vice President HUMPHREY and President Kennedy, (b) the failure of the District Commissioners to even forward to Congress those budget requests presented to them by the Board for funds to aid local art programs, and (c) strong community support for a realistic program providing financial aid to the District's art programs and groups.

It would seem to be the sounder and wiser course to work to maintain the independence and autonomy of the District of Columbia Recreation Board under home rule, and to support it in working out a viable art program which would include a revival of the spirit, intent, and even some of the bills offered by Vice President HUMPHREY, President Kennedy, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., myself, and others on a bipartisan basis to aid the District's own artists and art programs.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress.

IMPROVING THE OPPORTUNITY FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS TO ESTABLISH RETIREMENT PLAN

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in 1942, our tax laws were changed to offer substantial tax benefits to corporations and their employees in the establishment of pension plans, supplementing Social Security. There has been a tremendous growth of such plans over the past 20 years. Today, approximately 25 million persons are covered by private retirement plans and coverage is increasing at a rapid rate. This is good for the individual and the Nation, in that persons in their senior years will have some income upon which to depend and will, therefore, not be solely dependent upon Government or relatives. The largest segment of our population which is not participating in retirement plans is the 10 million self-employed persons and their 10 million employees. Without some tax deferral for retirement savings, adequate savings for old age by the self-employed is virtually impossible.

The result of the legislation enacted in 1942 was to discriminate in favor of employed persons and against all self-employed persons and their employees. To correct this inequity, the Congress in 1962 passed legislation to permit limited tax deferral on retirement savings by self-employed individuals and their employees. Although the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962 was a step forward, it by no means provides an adequate method for average self-employed individuals to establish retirement plans.

Over the long history of this legislation, the intended value was substantially diminished by amendments which were added in the final days of the 87th Congress in the other body. Although as passed by the House, the legislation would not have put the self-employed on a comparable basis with corporate employees, it would have provided considerable incentive for participation by self-employed individuals and their employees in tax-deferred private pension plans.

I have introduced legislation to amend the 1962 act by bringing it more in line with the legislation as passed by the House of Representatives on three occasions. My bill, H.R. 11173, would make two major improvements in the 1962 act.

First, the definition of "earned income" would be liberalized to provide a more realistic method for arriving at the income of a self-employed person whose earnings are derived from both personal services and capital. One of the largest occupational groups which are severely affected by the present definition of income under the 1962 act are farmers. Under the present law, a farmer would have to have an income of over $83,000 in order to qualify for setting aside $2,500 in a retirement plan.

Second, my bill would permit self-employed individuals to defer taxes on the entire amount put into a qualified retirement plan subject to limits provided by law. The House of Representatives approved on three occasions a full deduction, but an amendment on the floor of the other body reduced this to 50 percent of the amount which a self-employed individual contributes to a plan on his behalf. This 50-percent limitation in the 1962 act has destroyed much of the incentive for the establishment of retirement plans. Until this is corrected, there is little likelihood that professional persons, small business men, and farmers, will establish retirement plans for themselves and their employees. Certainly if a self-employed individual is willing to finance a retirement plan for his employees, he should receive a deferral of taxes on the entire contribution made on his own behalf just as is permitted for employees of the self-employed individual or of corporations.

If this Congress enacts legislation to bring about these two major improvements in the tax laws pertaining to retirement savings for self-employed individuals, some 20 million Americans would be given a better opportunity to provide for their retirement.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation pays its respects to the Constitution. The week has been set aside as the 178th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution by 39 delegates to the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia on September 17, 1787.

And this is certainly proper, for this document is one of the remarkable documents of world history, setting forth the idea that our Government is one to serve the interests of the people rather than the other way around.

And the Constitution specified the manner in which the people are to operate their Government through elected Representatives acting as a National Legislature, one of three coequal branches of the Federal Government.

The President has proclaimed this week of observance, and in his proclamation makes a fine statement:

> The Constitution is still the guarantee of our basic rights. It is still the promise of protection from government and by government.

One cannot help but wonder in this particular year if these words of the President are simply fine sounding words or whether the Nation still really considers the Constitution as it was intended—a protection of the people against government.

For running concurrently with the White House statement are at least three major Government efforts, each one of which does much damage to the principle highlighted in the President's statement. In fact, never before has the Constitution appeared so battered, buffeted, and bruised as it does today in September of 1965.

What are the three problem areas?

REAPPORTIONMENT

First, the Constitution leaves to the States the determination of the makeup

of State legislatures. This has been agreed upon by constitutional lawyers down through the years, and only recently has the idea even been brought into question.

The Supreme Court in 1964 presented an opinion which in effect decreed how the State legislatures were to be apportioned.

A major effort has been made in the Congress to approve an amendment specifically giving constitutional approval to any State plan of apportioning its own legislature if the State's voters approve the plan by referendum.

But the White House opposes it. The majority party in the House of Representatives has succeeded in preventing any consideration of it, and in the Senate has succeeded in delaying it, at least until next year. So the fact is that in all probability the people of the United States will be denied an opportunity to affirm the right of the people of any State to determine its own legislative apportionment.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

Second, the Constitution gives to the States the responsibility to establish voting qualifications. And until now each State has duly fulfilled this responsibility free of interference from the Federal Government.

Yet this year the President demanded that the Federal Government intervene to change the voting qualifications in some States, the selection of which was based on an artificial formula designed to penalize Southern States and not others.

The Congress, acting under a political control exercised from the White House, approved the President's proposal, and did so even though it could have approved instead another proposal to achieve the objective of equal voting opportunity without upsetting constitutional rights. Now illiterates are being registered by the thousands.

SPENDING

Third, section 9, article I of the Constitution states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Over the years the executive branch has steadily moved away from this requirement by succeeding in having Congress approve several methods of drawing money from the Treasury other than by appropriations.

This practice is called backdoor spending. It has been growing to the extent that in 1961 alone the executive branch requested more than $28 billion in backdoor spending, and was given almost $20 billion of those requests.

Even now in the time of a Congress which readily approves almost every White House request, the practice of backdoor spending is still growing, and presents one of the major concerns in Washington today.

Yes, we need to pay honor to the Constitution this week. We need to do more than speak fine words. There must be a public awareness of how the Federal Government is avoiding, violating, and thwarting constitutional guarantees of the people's right to protection from Government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on the conference report on S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965, I was unavoidably absent on official business. If I were present, I would have voted "yea."

SUPPORT FOR DISTRICT HOME RULE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the several local organizations not heard during the recent hearings on home rule held by Subcommittee No. 5 of the District of Columbia Committee was the National Capital Chapter of the American Jewish Congress. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement by that organization signed by Mrs. Murray Foss, executive secretary, in support of S. 1118:

STATEMENT BY MRS. FOSS

On behalf of the National Capital Chapter, American Jewish Congress, an organization deeply concerned with the expansion of democratic principles, we urge the committee to report favorably at an early date S. 1118.

One of the major paradoxes of American society has been that the residents of the National Capital are denied self-government. The representation available to every American citizen should at long last be provided for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

With responsible self-government, the pressing problems relating to housing, education, health, and protection of its residents could be more adequately met.

We therefore respectfully urge your support and favorable vote for S. 1118 providing home rule for the District of Columbia.

NATIONWIDE COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the last three Congresses, I have introduced legislation to require that temporary summer appointments in Federal positions in the Washington metropolitan area be subject to the apportionment requirements of the Civil Service Act. The legislation would provide a more equitable opportunity for young people throughout the Nation to benefit from summer employment in the Nation's capital.

The best way to achieve this highly desirable purpose, of course, is to require by law that appointments to such jobs be based upon civil service examinations.

The bills I sponsored were approved by the House of Representatives in the 87th and 88th Congresses, but the other body failed to act. More recently, my current bill, H.R. 242, was approved by the House of Representatives on July 12, 1965, and is now pending in the Senate.

On Monday, September 20, 1965, the Civil Service Commission gave full recognition to the merits of my proposal by announcing that it plans to hold nationwide competitive examinations for most summer Federal positions in the Washington, D.C., area for the summer of 1966 and subsequent summers.

The Commission stated that the purpose of its new program is to give young people from other parts of the country an opportunity to serve in temporary Government positions during the summer months. Consistent with the objective of my bill, the Commission announced that the program is designed to assure that students hired for summer positions in Washington are selected on a merit basis and to provide broader geographical distribution of summer appointments in our Nation's Capital.

During the course of hearings on this legislation, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service rather clearly established that nepotism and both personal and political patronage have played prominent roles in appointments to summer positions in the Federal Government. My bill—and to a large extent the recent action of the Civil Service Commission—should reduce the recurrence in the future of these abuses of the merit civil service system.

Of particular significance is the statement of the Commission that "priority for appointment would be given to residents of other States in an effort to bring in highly qualified young people from all over the Nation to gain the broadening experience of summer employment in a Federal job in Washington."

In my judgment the Commission has taken a progressive step in the announcement of this program and is to be commended for its move toward strengthening the merit system. However, whether the program will be fully and permanently effective without legislation remains to be seen. To make certain, it is my earnest hope that the other body will act favorably on my bill, H.R. 242, so that the type of program announced by the Civil Service Commission will be made permanent and not be changed or revoked by some future administrative policy.

In order that the Members may be more fully informed regarding this program of the Civil Service Commission, I insert the Commission's press release dated September 20, 1965, immediately following my remarks:

PRESS RELEASE FROM U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Civil Service Commission has opened discussion of its plans for competitive examinations for most Federal summer employment in 1966 and subsequent years. The details of these plans were reviewed with Federal personnel officers last week. Full information will be released later after consultation and the development of complete information.

The plan is designed to assure that employees temporarily hired to work during the summer are selected on a merit basis and to provide for broader geographical distribution of summer appointments in the Washington metropolitan area. Priority for appointment would be given to residents of other States in an effort to bring in highly qualified young people from all over the Nation to gain the broadening experience of summer employment in a Federal job in Washington.

A yearly nationwide examination for summer employment, both in Washington and other locations, would cover clerks, stenographers, typists, office machine operators, and laboratory and scientific aides at grades GS-1 through GS-4. These categories constitute over half of the positions filled by summer employment in the Washington, D.C., area, and about one-fourth of the jobs filled at field locations. Applicants would take a written test and meet the full civil service qualification requirements in order to obtain summer employment.

A competitive testing plan is also being developed for summer employment in post offices throughout the Nation. Examinations to be held will be separate from the general summer employment examination and will be conducted by Post Office Boards of Civil Service Examiners under the supervision of the Civil Service Commission.

Summer hiring programs not covered by the new competitive examinations would be required to meet Civil Service Commission requirements for competition and consideration of merit in selection of all appointees. These programs cover blue-collar workers, certain summer interns, and other miscellaneous categories of such variety that a common written test is not feasible.

Summer hiring programs for the disadvantaged, which call for referral of needy youths by Employment Service offices or by welfare organizations and, in many cases, pay lower wages, would not be affected by the new competitive examining programs.

Present policies forbidding summer employment of sons or daughters of Federal employees in the same agencies would be continued.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION PROPOSAL FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT, 1966

I. Background and basic issues.

II. The broad elements of a program:

A. Disadvantaged—separate.

B. Post Office—special competition.

C. Office and science assistants, GS-1 to GS-4 (main item for attention today).

D. Others: (All jobs not covered by C.) Individual agency merit plans. Examples: GS-5 and above, wage board, certain seasonal jobs, etc.

III. Office and science assistants:

A. Coverage. All appointments to GS-1 to GS-4 clerks, stenographers, typists, office machine operators, and laboratory and science aides.

B. Nationwide written examination—general characteristics:

1. Test of verbal abilities, abstract reasoning, chart interpretation, clerical skills (1¾ hours).

2. Subsequent filing of applications with individual agencies.

3. Supplementary agency testing for special skills—typing, stenography, etc.—plus agency application of X-118 experience and training standards.

4. Individual agencywide eligible lists; one person in each agency to be responsible.

5. Certification and appointment by rating categories (95 to 100, 90 to 94, etc.).

6. Limitation on applicant filing to two or three agencies.

7. Appointment under 700-hour authority.

8. Cost prorated on basis of proportionate hires.

C. Special provisions for Washington area:

1. Each eligible to apply—

(a) To three agencies; or

(b) To two agencies and a special interagency board established by CSC.

2. Within each 5-point test rating category, eligibles further grouped by—

(a) Residents outside District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia;

(b) Residents within District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

3. After using up eligibles from one subcategory, agency must get eligibles from interagency board before appointing from next subcategory.

D. Special provisions for field:

1. Applicants file directly with no more than three establishments.

2. No central referral or subcategories based on residence.

E. Time schedule:

September: Begin printing of instructions, informational brochure, tests, application forms, etc.

Late November: Formal announcement of examination and widespread distribution of brochures.

January 3: Cutoff date for filing.

February 5: Examination held.

March 1: Notice of ratings mailed, along with simplified application form and detailed instructions about opportunities and how to apply.

April 15: Last date for receipt of applications by agencies.

May 1: Each agency establishes eligible list (copy to CSC).

IV. Nepotism still outlawed.

V. Advantages:

A. Simpler than present.

B. Meets problem of diversity.

C. Insures greater emphasis on merit.

D. Insures due weight to apportionment.

E. Provides better publicity and information.

F. Requires more advance planning.

G. Regularizes time schedules and avoids last-minute panic.

H. Examination covers 54 percent of Washington jobs; 25 percent of field.

I. Is operationally feasible.

J. Cost cheap to users.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY STAFF ON SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution providing for the establishment of an agency in the Executive Office of the President to be known as the President's Advisory Staff on Scientific Information Management.

The purpose of the resolution is to assemble at the highest level of Government an extremely high caliber staff of economists, sociologists, mathematicians and scientists to develop decision-aiding systems, for use by the Government.

Such action is necessary, because ever since World War II the rapid rate of change, the breadth and depth of new knowledge and the complexity and interdependence of today's sociological, technological, economic and governmental factors has exceeded the normal capacity of the human mind for assimilation on a scale equal to the demands of this new environment.

Responsible decisionmakers in Government and in industry need new techniques and systems for organizing, storing, retrieving, integrating, analyzing and testing the multitude of factors upon which a rational decision must rest.

Certain areas of industry and certain areas of Government have developed information structures and decision-aiding techniques. Some of these new techniques make substantial use of mathematics and the computer sciences, mathematical programing, mathematical simulation and econometrics.

Now is the time to use these techniques at the highest level of Government where the mass of relevant and important information is the largest, where the complexity of the interrelationships is the greatest and, hence, where the decisionmaking is most difficult.

The agency which this resolution would establish will give us a start on discovering and applying new information management techniques to the major unsolved problems of our society.

This proposal was first put forward a year ago by the then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. In introducing then such a resolution Mr. HUMPHREY said:

> Many of the current and impending problems of our society will remain insolvable until we discover and adapt information management and decision-aiding techniques which are commensurate with the changes which have occurred and will occur in our national and international environment.

Mr. HUMPHREY found it evident that:

> We have many serious unsolved problems which exceed in scope and complexity present information management and problem-solving structures.

Experts say that the human mind has difficulty in considering more than 10 or 20 factors at the same time in making decisions. Yet, the unsolved problems of our society may require thousands or hundreds of thousands of factors or subfactors to be considered. Industry has learned to simulate mathematically a given environment. By varying the input assumptions or by varying subdecisions the decisionmaker can be given rational basis on which to make alternative decisions.

It should be emphasized that such decision-aiding techniques are only to aid decisionmakers by providing them with the type of information which will, along with other factors, including their own

judgment and experience, assist them in establishing sound policies and in making meaningful decisions.

Thus, these modern techniques are consistent with the processes of democratic government. The use of them may be necessary for the survival of democratic government.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public of this country is well acquainted with the diseases of the heart, cancer, mental illness, and many others, because of the wide publicity these diseases have been given in the press and other media of communication. However, many dreaded diseases have not come to the attention of the general public in as great a scope as the ones I just mentioned, because not much has been said about them.

Today, I am introducing a House joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week, and wish to discuss some of the aspects of this dreaded disease.

Parkinson's disease is a progressive, disabling neurological disorder known to man since Biblical times as "shaking palsy" and first described in the second century A.D. by Galen, a Greek physician living in Rome. A few physicians wrote about it in the 17th century, but not until 1817 was it distinguished from several related disorders. Dr. James Parkinson, of London, is his "Essay on the Shaking Palsy," characterized it as involving "involuntary tremulous motion, with lessened muscular power in parts not in action and even when supported; with a propensity to bend the trunk forward and to pass from a walking to a running pace; the senses and intellect being uninjured." His description remains clinically accurate.

Strictly speaking, Parkinson's disease or Parkinsonism is not a disease but a group of symptoms. The first symptom is usually a slight and rhythmic tremor in one of the limbs which in time spreads and increases in intensity. Soon after the trembling begins, muscular rigidity sets in. This rigidity in combination with a progressive loss of semiautomatic movements produces the characteristic stooped posture, shuffling gait, and loss of facial expression. The symptoms occur in varying degrees in different patients, but in most cases eventually produce disability and often complete helplessness. The course of the disease is variable, but usually there is a rapid decline within 10 years of its onset. It is almost never the direct cause of death, but does contribute to other causes.

Although it may occur at any age, Parkinson's disease usually strikes people in their 50's and 60's. Epidemiological studies estimate that approximately half a million Americans are afflicted—some estimates are much higher—and that between 25,000 and 43,000 new cases develop annually. The rate is approximately twice as high for men as for women and three times higher for white persons than nonwhite. In 25 countries where its distribution has been studied, no consistent geographic pattern has been observed.

The causes of Parkinsonism are not known. The basic disturbance is believed to be malfunctioning of centers in the interior of the brain—possibly of the thalamus, a portion of the basal ganglia, which coordinates information received from the senses and interacts with other areas of the brain to convert these sensory stimuli into physical movement. But the cause of the malfunctioning remains a mystery. Certain forms of the disease are thought to result from a virus; "postencephalitic Parkinsonism" has appeared up to 25 years after an attack of encephalitis. Other forms may be due to subtle circulation changes in the brain. A number of tranquilizers used in heavy doses to treat mental illness produce symptoms so similar to some symptoms of Parkinson's disease that chemical imbalance in the body is suggested as a cause. Symptoms of Parkinsonism are also produced by a few poisons. Hereditary susceptibility is possible in other cases.

Nor is there any cure. Drugs, surgery, and physical rehabilitation are used with varying success to relieve the symptoms. There are approximately a dozen frequently prescribed drugs; when therapy is successful, these provide a 25- to 50-percent control of rigidity, tremor, and lethargy. Many of them, however, lose their value for a particular patient over a period of time, and some of them have unpleasant side effects. But even small improvements significantly affect the performance of most patients. There are as yet no drugs capable of restoring automatic movements or correcting weakness.

Surgery is attempted only in certain cases, usually younger patients who suffer mainly from tremor or whose rigidity is limited to one side of the body. Surgical techniques include cutting out or destroying—most frequently by injection of chemical agents or use of local freezing—small sections of the thalamus. Recently, investigators have discovered how to pick up the brain's electric signals and convert them to sound pulses capable of guiding the surgeon to the exact area to be destroyed.

Physical therapy is helpful in relaxing rigid muscles and can delay the onset of severe disability. Special exercises have been devised to enable patients to carry on regular programs of prescribed exercise without the constant aid of a physical therapist. In addition, every physical activity—even the most simple—can be considered exercise and therefore useful in preserving as much function as possible.

With both cause and cure unknown and current therapy severely limited in effectiveness, a great deal of hope and effort has been put into research, the bulk of it federally sponsored.

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of the National Institutes of Health supports many research projects in universities and other research centers throughout the country as well as conducting its own projects. In fiscal year 1965, the NINDB spent almost $3 million for research into chronic neurological disorders of aging, the main emphasis of which was Parkinsonism and related disorders; this amount was distributed among 81 extramural projects and 13 intramural. The Institute's program has focused on the development of new drugs, the improvement of surgical techniques, a search for abnormalities of brain chemistry, the evaluation of hereditory factors, a study of the role of viruses and of the anatomical, physiological, and pathological basis of the disease.

Important advances have been made in the last few years. The rigidity and tremor symptomatic of Parkinsonism can be attributed to an "imbalance between the alpha and gamma motor systems of the brain," and "the characterization of certain specific chemical compounds involved in the activity of these two systems suggest that a specific enzyme defect may be involved in some form of the disorder."

To encourage a multidisciplinary approach to Parkinsonism, the institute is providing support for the Parkinson's Disease Information and Research Center at Columbia University. The center's information section is collecting research findings both here and abroad, provides library services, and publishes periodic reviews of work in the field in an attempt to keep the world's 500 Parkinson's researchers abreast of current developments. It also sponsors symposia for the purpose of stimulating critical evaluation of research results. The clinical center's program integrates basic and clinical research and is aimed at "determining the cause, improving diagnostic techniques, and developing methods of treatment" for Parkinson's and related disorders. It also trains personnel for research.

There are, in addition, a number of private organizations interested in Parkinson's disease, the oldest of them formed less than 10 years ago. The American Parkinson Disease Association maintains an outpatient rehabilitation center in Miami and is currently attempting to raise funds for an associated hospital and care center. The National Parkinson Foundation sponsors some research, develops referral services for patients and families, and distributes information. The Parkinson Disease Foundation raises funds to support research.

This combination of private and Government interest allied with the international concern and determination evidenced in the past few years are reason to hope that the prevention and control of Parkinsonism will someday be possible.

CRILE HOSPITAL SITE TO BECOME GREATER CLEVELAND EDUCATIONAL CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, education in Greater Cleveland received a great lift today. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informed me by letter today that a decision had been made to approve the use of the Crile Veterans' Administration Hospital property for Cuyahoga Community College and the Parma Public School system. The Crile Hospital property has been vacant for some time and various proposals have been advanced for its use. Since Crile Hospital is in my district, I made a canvass in 1961 among responsible civic leaders to determine the best possible use of this valuable property. The almost unanimous opinion was that efforts should be made to secure use of this property for a community college and for the public school system of rapidly expanding Parma.

With the cooperation of Mayor James Day of Parma, former superintendent of Parma schools, Dr. Paul W. Briggs, the present superintendent, Stuart L. Openlander, Dr. Charles E. Chapman, president of Cuyahoga Community College, and the mayors of nine adjoining communities, these efforts have been successful. The Division of Surplus Property Utilization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has concluded that there is a serious need for educational facilities in the area, both at the elementary-secondary and higher educational levels. As a consequence 103 acres of improved land with 92 buildings will be made available as a campus for Cuyahoga Community College and 8 acres of unimproved land will be made available to the Parma public schools as a site for an elementary school. The General Services Administration is now in the process of preparing the necessary conveyance documents to transfer these properties.

Cuyahoga Community College is Ohio's first public community junior college. It opened instructional programs in September of 1963 with a student body in excess of 3,000. Student enrollment in 1964 reached 6,500 and it is expected to reach 8,000 this fall term. By 1970 this college, together with our newly established Cleveland State University, will be expected to accommodate 40,000 young men and women of college age. From these trends it is quite obvious that the higher educational needs of Greater Cleveland present a real challenge and that the decision of our Government to make the Crile Veterans' Hospital property available to assist in meeting this challenge is a practical one. It has often been said that the soundest investment we can make in the future of our Nation is in the field of education. This decision by our Government gives life to that belief.

On behalf of all those in Greater Cleveland who have worked to make this project a reality, I express appreciation to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and his able assistant, Mr. Joseph Ventura, Mr. William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to the staff members of these able public servants who have participated in the many conferences involved in the review of the proposals made by the civic and education leaders of Greater Cleveland.

This is good news for many families in Greater Cleveland who have or will soon have children of college age and ambition. I am listing the mayors of the cities who cooperated in this community-wide effort to utilize the Crile Hospital site as an educational center:

	Population
James W. Day (Parma)	98,000
John M. Coyne (Brooklyn)	13,000
Paul W. Cassidy (Parma Heights)	24,000
Stephen Tymcio (Middleburg Heights)	10,000
Wm. L. Tomson (Strongsville)	11,000
Lester Edgerton (North Royalton)	11,000
J. B. Crabbs (Berea)	19,000
V. C. Kraushaar (Brooklyn Heights)	2,000
Joseph G. Graskemper (Seven Hills)	7,000
John A. Polonye (Brook Park)	23,500

Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Press carried an article on September 8, 1964, which underlined the hopes of the people of Parma and Parma Heights that a community college would be established on the Crile Hospital site. I include that article in my remarks because it indicates why I gave my full support for the community college:

PUT COLLEGE ON CRILE SITE, SAYS FEIGHAN

The people of Parma and Parma Heights want a college, not a mental institution or antipoverty camp located on the Crile Hospital site, Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN said in a statement today.

He said he had been working closely with Parma's Mayor James Day to help bring a community college to the former veterans hospital grounds on York Road.

"It is my opinion that the people of the Parma area are the best judges as to how the Crile Hospital site should be used," said the Democratic Congressman. "Parma is one of our finest residential communities and I am confident the people of Parma want to keep it that way," he said.

Congressman FEIGHAN said he would continue to work with Mayor Day and others "to secure State and Federal assistance in order that a community college offering a diversified college education will be established on the Crile Hospital site."

Officials of the Cuyahoga Community College have been in touch with Federal officials in relation to the Crile property but no steps have been taken to acquire the site.

Ohio welfare officials have indicated a desire to open a training school for the mentally retarded. Last week it was proposed the land be used as a camp for the training of unemployed youth in the Government's antipoverty program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. RYAN), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 30 minutes, on September 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter on S. 2300.

Mr. STANTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2070. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 906. An act to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1623. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1975. An act to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission; and

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

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. 1395. An act for the relief of Irene McCafferty;

H.R. 2694. An act for the relief of John Allen;

H.R. 2926. An act for the relief of Efstahia Giannos;

H.R. 2933. An act for the relief of Kim Jai Sung;

H.R. 3062. An act for the relief of Son Chung Ja;

H.R. 3337. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonio de Oyarzabal;

H.R. 3765. An act for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis;

H.R. 3989. An act to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts;

H.R. 4596. An act for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling;

H.R. 5252. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 5839. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrie, U.S. Marine Corps;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Cecil Graham;

H.R. 5903. An act for the relief of William C. Page;

H.R. 5768. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6294. An act to authorize Secret Service agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss;

H.R. 8212. An act for the relief of Kent A. Herath; and

H.R. 8352. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, September 22, 1965, 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:

1602. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title 1, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during June 1965 and August 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1603. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared for the following watersheds: Zeigler Creek, Nebr.; Elko, Nev.; Swan Quarter, N.C.; Frogville Creek, Okla.; Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 1005), and to the authority delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1604. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1605. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1606. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1607. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of August 1965 pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1608. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in pricing of change orders for construction of naval vessels, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1609. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings by direct rather than indirect procurement of selected subsystems for F-4 type of aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1610. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of readiness of combat and combat-support equipment assigned to the 2d Marine Division and Force Troops, Camp Lejeune, N.C., U.S. Marine Corps, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1611. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 404, 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement which have been prepared for the following watersheds: Bayou Boeuf, La.; Mauch Chunk Creek, Pa.; Middle Creek, Pa.; and Oil Creek, Pa., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and to the authority delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1613. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, transmitting a status and financial report for the period July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 10779. A bill to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1040). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10027. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 6125. A bill to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 9495. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report on Federal opinion on the need for an Indian treaty study; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11096. A bill to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11135. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; with amendment (Rept. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 11185. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern stern-ramp trawlers to be used for experimental, commercial fishing, research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11186. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to children over 18 and under 22 who are full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 11187. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 11188. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 11189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11190. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to permit a person insured under such act to provide for the payment of insurance in a lump sum or in monthly installments; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11191. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for traumatic aneurysm and malignant tumors (cancer) which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 11192. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11193. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 11194. A bill to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 11195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an agency in the Executive Office of the President to be known as the President's Advisory Staff on Scientific Information Management; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim November 13 of each year as "National Dental Assistants Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 668. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually proclamations designating the Sunday of each year which occurs immediately preceding February 22 as Freedom Sunday and the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs as Freedom Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 669. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session, to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11196. A bill for the relief of Donato Minerva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11197. A bill for the relief of Winston Nurse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11198. A bill for the relief of Spiridon Andreadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 11199. A bill for the relief of Sister Emidia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11200. A bill for the relief of Nicholas and Triseygeny Dakalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11201. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. and Mrs. Joseph J. (Janet) Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11202. A bill for the relief of Silvestre Giannetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11203. A bill for the relief of Pietro Bataglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salute to the Federal Republic of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 21st of September, today, marks the 16th anniversary of the Federal Republic of Germany. On this occasion we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Ludwig Erhard, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, and to His Excellency Heinrich Knappstein, the German Ambassador to the United States.

This date markes 16 years of spectacular growth and political stability for this amazing country.

As Americans we can be doubly proud as we note the record of economic and political accomplishments achieved by the Federal Republic since World War II. The democratic character and political stability of our stanch ally in Bonn vindicate the faith postwar American planners placed in the future of West Germany. Beyond rewarding the policies of those Americans who rejected the brutal Soviet formula of exploitation and subjugation in favor of a revived and rejuvenated Germany, the manner in which the German miracle has been achieved represents a shining example of the successful application of the American system of federal democracy and free enterprise.

As we look back to the political environment of the new Federal Republic of 1949 it is difficult, in the light of the stability of German federalism today, for us to remember the uncertainties and fears that surrounded the application of the new Bonn constitution. At that time many felt that the division of powers, so successful in our own Constitution, would either collapse or lead to the paralysis of government in a nation with traditions of either state autonomy or highly centralized government. Some feared the possibility of political anarchy resulting from unrestrained elements of separatism in the states; others feared a return to the authoritarianism which blighted the German political landscape in the recent past.

Fortunately, both medieval separatism and modern authoritarianism have given way to German liberalism, a strain in German political thought which began to take root in the middle of the 19th century. The mixture of traditional German liberalism with American federalism has resulted in the smoothly functioning democratic system so clearly evidenced by Sunday's elections.

The German economic program, which is so often referred to as the economic miracle of Europe, is closely related to the free enterprise system of the United States. Without foregoing the social responsibilities which have been rooted in German politicoeconomic practice since Bismarck, Germany has applied a minimum of governmental control in its spectacular rise from the rubble and ashes of World War II into one of the great economic powers of the world today. The economic miracle is a testimony to the initiative of the German people and the program of free enterprise coupled with social responsibility—another design which we share with our German neighbors.

These are grand achievements and no little source of encouragement in a world beset with political instability and economic crises.

The foreign policies—both economic and political—of the Federal Republic have been even more encouraging. A foremost leader in the economic and political integration of Europe, Germany continues to stand as a steadfast ally of the United States and stanch champion of the Western alliance.

Such are the remarkable accomplishments of the last 16 years. It is with great pleasure that I take this moment to salute the achievements of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Hon. Eugene Zuckert—A Great Leader of the U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to pay tribute today to the distinguished Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Eugene Zuckert, who has resigned, effective September 30 next.

Secretary Zuckert brought years of knowledge and valuable governmental experience to the Office of Secretary of the Air Force when he assumed that position in 1961.

He has done an excellent job. He has rendered an outstanding public service.

As he leaves the Office of Secretary, he leaves an Air Force second to none in the world. He leaves a U.S. Air Force that is fulfilling its obligations in the