thing that is absolutely certain is, the unity and firmness and resolution of the free nations during the past few years have caused the Soviet policy to fail, and today they are trying to figure out how they are going to get a better one."

This change in Soviet policy is known to every schoolboy; and every mother knows the world is now at peace.

On Monday, Senator FULBRIGHT asked questions, on the floor of the Senate, which Secretary Dulles had already answered Sunday night. I wish the Senator had read Secretary Dulles' speech before he made his own.

For example, Senator Fulbright asked:

"Will he (Dulles) give us a fair chance to decide for ourselves with full knowledge of the facts, what efforts we should make for our own salvation, or will he lull us to sleep in an hour when the Soviet Union has launched a powerful diplomatic offensive against us".

The Secretary's answer given the day before was that if we and other free nations play our proper part, "we can face the future not with complacency—that would be disastrous—but with confidence".

On Monday, Senator FULBRIGHT asked: "Will such a public opinion be prepared to make new sacrifices when the Secretary of State implies that the battle against the Soviet bid for world domination has been won?"

But the day before the Secretary had answered that the Communist had come up against the granite of our declared strength, and, he went on to say:

"If that granite should turn to putty, then violence and threat of war could again become the order of the day". Mr. Dulles went on to say that we had new problems which "will require new efforts; without relaxation of the old cohesion, resolution, vigilance and strength".

I wish the Senator had taken the time to read Secretary Dulles' speech, which the Senator had previously said he looked forward to, before he made this attack on the Secretary.

Senator FULBRIGHT also asked if our people would support new outlays for foreign aid with Secretary Dulles saying that Soviet designs had been frustrated already.

But the day before Secretary Dulles had said: "If there is less apparent intolerance and less reliance on violence, there is perhaps more reliance than ever on division, enticement and duplicity."

Does that sound like saying that Soviet designs are already frustrated?

Senator FULBRIGHT said that the world "believes that America can think of the fight for peace in no terms except that of military alliances and shipment of arms."

I do not know the Senator's reason for that belief, but the thought could not have come from Mr. Dulles. The day before the Secretary had said:

Western efforts to advance the economic well-being of the less developed countries are nothing new. We need not be panicked by the new Soviet economic policy. With or without the so-called competition of the U. S. S. R., we propose to go forward with sound policies to aid the economic progress of less developed countries.

Senator FULBRIGHT could not have been more in error in the views he attributed to Secretary Dulles—views directly contrary to those given in the Secretary's speech of the day before.

Secretary Dulles has spent much of the last 3 years traveling about the world to promote the job of world peace. He has done so as a conscientious public servant, and as a fine American.

I am certain that the political aspects of achieving peace were the very least of his motives.

I regret very much that the Senator from Arkansas should have added to the Secretary's many burdens by attacking him only because his policy has been successful and the truth does not require him to give pessimistic reports.

Senator FULBRIGHT may regard this as bad campaign politics for his party; but it is good news for the American people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Louis F. Kreek, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner-in-Chief in the Patent Office.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles K. Rice, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Earl Freeman Hastings, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1959.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Franklin G. Floete, of Iowa, to be Administrator of General Services.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Joseph P. Lieb, of Florida, to be United States district judge, southern district of Florida.

John M. Cashin, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York.

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge, western district of Oklahoma.

R. Dorsey Watkins, of Maryland, to be United States district judge, district of Maryland.

Ewing T. Kerr, of Wyoming, to be United States district judge, district of Wyoming.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Oliver Gasch, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney, District of Columbia, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Gerald Francis Bracken, of Maryland, to be United States marshal, district of Maryland.

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal, northern district of Mississippi, for a term of 4 years.

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal, middle district of Pennsylvania.

Albert Di Meolo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal, western district of Pennsylvania.

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal, district of Puerto Rico.

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Yakov R. Hilsenrath, Beth Judah Temple, North Wildwood, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose hands are the spirits of all flesh and in whose eyes all tomorrows stand revealed as today, we invoke Thy blessings upon the Members of this Congress who are gathered to take counsel with one another and deliberate concerning the welfare of man, the crown of Thy creations.

May harmony and sincerity of purpose ever guide their endeavors, unity, and a genuine spirit of brotherhood motivate their deliberations and resolves.

Guide and aid them to disperse the clouds of aggression and insecurity hovering over mankind. May all whom Thou hast created enjoy the right to live and work, to think and speak, in accordance with the dictates of their God-given conscience.

O God, speedily grant all mankind Thy most precious gift, peace. Enable Thy children to achieve and preserve it amidst every trial and circumstance. Inspire the members of our Government to contribute their energies toward making the United States of America an effective instrument to safeguard world security. Help them to usher in the long-awaited era when freedom's holy light will flood the world as the waters cover the sea. We ask this not for personal advantage but for the establishment of a Godly world and the recognition of Thy will in the hearts of all men. Amen.

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

JANE EDITH THOMAS

Mr. FEIGHAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas and for other purposes.

A MORNING WISH

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, when there is so much confusion, distrust, and misunderstanding in the world, it is comforting to read a statement like this which I ran onto in the Sunshine magazine the other day, written by W. R. Hunt. I wish to make it a part of my remarks at this time:

A MORNING WISH

(By W. R. Hunt)

The sun is rising on the morning of another day. What can I wish that this day may bring to me? Nothing that shall make the world of others poorer, nothing at the expense of other men; but just those few

things which, in their coming, do not stop with me, but touch me, rather, as they pass and gather strength:

A few friends who understand me, and yet remain my friends.

A work to do which has real value, without which the world would feel poorer.

A return for that work small enough not to tax unduly anyone who pays.

A mind unafraid to travel, even though the trail be not blazed.

An understanding heart.

A sight of the eternal hills and unresting sea, and of something beautiful the hand of man has made.

A sense of humor and the power to laugh.

A little leisure with nothing to do.

A few moments of quiet, silent meditation, to sense the presence of God.

And patience to wait for these things, with the wisdom to know them when they come.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit while the House is in session next week, during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state how thrilled I was to hear the speech of the President of Italy, the Honorable Giovanni Gronchi, who addressed us yesterday. I felt that the address was superlative in content and in delivery.

I was most fortunate because during his address I was privileged to sit next to my distinguished colleagues from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO and Mr. ADDONIZIO], who most fluently translated the address as the President spoke. I must say their translation was almost as eloquent as the address itself. I know that all the comments I heard here were most favorable to the President and I am sure the President again demonstrated how much civilization owes to Italy, this great and historic nation which has cradled us in our civilization and in our religion. Truly as President Gronchi said, The Italy before us today—as typified by himself—was an outstanding example of culture and democracy.

EISENHOWER'S DECISION

Mr. ABERNETHY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the decision of President Eisenhower to offer himself as a candidate for a second term will be encouraging to his friends who will take it as proof that he has made complete recovery from his illness.

We must assume that in his own mind Mr. Eisenhower has determined that he is not only capable of resuming the full burden of the presidency but that the chances are that he will be able to do so for the full 4 years of a second term. A decision on any other basis would have been unthinkable.

In his first campaign for the presidency, Mr. Eisenhower received considerable support in the TVA area. His record, and that of his administration on TVA matters, has not been what the people of the TVA area had been promised and led to expect. They will take this into consideration next November.

ITALY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, a few moments ago concerning the address of the President of Italy. I did not have the benefit yesterday of interpreters, and I do not understand the Italian language, but I can read the English language. I was delighted to read in his address that there is a plus balance in the Italian treasury. I can say to my colleague from New Jersey that I will certainly be down here in the well of the House when the foreign WPA bill comes along to remind him of that balance in the Italian treasury, if there are any funds in that bill for Italy.

A NEW OBSERVANCE OF ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at a breakfast hosted by the New Jersey division of the American Legion, regret was expressed that we had allowed observance of Armistice Day to lapse and substituted for it Veterans' Day.

With all due respect to the veterans, armistice is the result of their actions; homage to veterans is a homage paid to people as against that which is inherent in the word "armistice," which means the homage we pay to the principles of peace; they are eternal.

We today are in an armistice not only in Asia but in Europe and other parts of the world.

I have assurances that the New Jersey unit of the American Legion is going to search the problem so that we here in the United States and possibly in Europe and Asia can have a universal day of armistice observance to keep the peace we are now in.

In the old days, armistice used to be called Trève de Dieu; that is, every Friday from sundown to sunup Monday, Christians on the Crusades ceased fighting and observed a 2½-day period of contemplation and prayer. In our time, Trève de Dieu got to be known after World War I as armistice. Many people thought of the armistice after World War I as in connection with the German war.

We do not want that connotation at all. We want armistice to mean observance of those principles for which we took up and laid down arms, and the breach of which arms will again be taken up, such as freedom of the seas, freedom to draw a breath whether you are small or large in the family of nations, and other free things involved in the moral sense of man, like those mentioned in the New York Times editorial of November 11, 1953, entitled "The Dead Did Not Fail."

I hope that the New Jersey division of the American Legion is successful in bringing about a new observance of Armistice Day the world around. It might conceivably help us broaden the span of peace from 21½ years between wars to a lifetime. Indeed, we have advanced the span of peace from 2½ days to an average of 21½ years—1918 to 1941 in Europe; 1941 to 1950 in Asia—Korea—notwithstanding. For the world, 1956—?

LEGISLATION WITH REFERENCE TO WHEAT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country the Republicans are taking a terrific lot of criticism because of the present farm policy. The Republicans are not to blame for that situation at all. But we have been sitting here and taking it without making reply. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] who is listening so attentively, knows that. The Senate has passed a bill which would help us out on the wheat surplus and correct a part of the error which was made when the legislation was written by our Democratic opponents. That is really where the blame belongs, over on the other side. I cannot understand why that Committee on Agriculture is pigeonholing legislation which will corect that situation with reference to wheat. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] will tell us about it. He would not be disclosing any secrets if he did tell us just Democratic members are holding up remedial relief.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Evidently there is no quorum 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. 13]

Bailey	Gamble	Prouty
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Blitch	Hillings	Scrivner
Bowler	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Boykin	Kee	Staggers
Burnside	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Byrd	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Chatham	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	Mollohan	Tollefson
Derounian	Powell	Watts
Eberharter	Preston	Wharton
Fountain	Priest	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and ninety-two Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3383, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] had 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] had been recognized for 10 minutes, and had consumed one-half minute of his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California for 9½ minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that one of the proponents for this bill has repeatedly referred to the Colorado River Association's so-called lobbying and expenditures in opposition to the upper Colorado project. No specific charge has been made of wrongdoing. The figures are drawn from official reports filed by the association in compliance with the law passed by Congress.

Any attempt by innuendo or otherwise to prejudice the Members' minds for this bill is, in my opinion, a desperate attempt to becloud the real issues.

The Colorado River Association and its attorneys, engineers, and research specialists are employees of the State of California, the cities of southern California, and the great irrigation districts of California. They are being paid by the taxpayers and property owners of California and honorable and legally established associations whose sole aim is to protect the water rights of over 6 million people and their property rights of more than $10 billion.

No hint of scandal has ever touched their proper and legal advocacy of the interests so vital to our State. So let's have no more of this sly type of debate.

Let's proceed to the issues.

I opposed the Dixon-Yates contract because it was a $100 million give away to private utilities of taxpayers' funds.

I am opposed to the give away of the Hell's Canyon Dam sites to private utilities because it will deprive the people of that area for all time to come of the benefits of cheap public power. They are giving away something that belongs to the Federal Government.

I am opposed to the upper Colorado River project for the same reason. It will also, for all practical purposes, cause the Federal Government to lose the advantage of its own dam sites.

It will lose for a hundred years the opportunity of the people of the upper basin to obtain cheap public power from federally-owned dam sites and facilities.

The proposed 6-mill-per-kilowatt contracts with the 10 private utilities in the upper basin will fasten on the consumers of that area high-priced private power rates for the foreseeable future.

The Federal Government will spend a half billion dollars for the dams, generating equipment, and transmission lines, and then turn the electricity over to the private profit-making utilities.

I know they will say that the preference right is in there, but there are very few, if any, organizations available to exercise the preference right, and there are over 6,600 miles of privately owned transmission lines. You have heard many Members of this House get up and object to transmission lines from public power dams to the load center points. The Government also pays for the transmission lines from these upper Colorado Basin dams to the private utility load center distributing points.

This bill represents the biggest giveaway of all time, a $453 million capital investment in dams and facilities. These are owned by the Federal Government, but the resulting electricity will be given to 10 private power companies so that they can be relieved of future generating investments in this area. Remember, no power is needed there at this time. The private power companies have said that they are keeping up with the demand so this bill will give for the foreseeable future Government-generated and Government-paid-for power to the utility companies at the cost that they can now produce kilowatts with coal-generating plants. The power when sold on the basis of a 6-mills contract to the private utilities will not be cheap public power, it will be high-priced private power. My friends from the Tennessee Valley and from the Grand Coulee and from the Shasta area who pride themselves on supporting cheap public power for the masses of the people, let me say to you, salve your conscience on this one. This is an occasion where you are turning over millions and millions of kilowatts to private power companies to sell at profit-making private-power prices to the people of that area, and you are denying the people the right to use those facilities and those damsites for all future time to generate the cheap power that means so much to the progress of civilization in that area.

Now, let us turn to a comparison between the Hoover Dam project and the upper Colorado River Dam project. We have heard that referred to by several of the speakers. In the case of the Hoover Dam it was put in on the basis of a 50-year amortization, paying 4 percent at first, and they reduced it after that to 3 percent interest.

The Colorado project is proposed on the basis of 100 years amortization. We had firm power contracts for 2 mills per kilowatt before we built the Hoover Dam. You have no firm contracts at all on this proposed project. You merely have tentative offers of 6 mills from the private power companies. The private power companies will not put their money on the line at 6 mills, and yet it is the 6 mills sale that you are depending upon for the feasibility—question mark—of your project.

Ninety-one percent of the power that comes from the Hoover Dam into California goes to publicly owned distributing centers and 9 percent to private. All of this—100 percent of the upper basin project's power, with the exception of 1 or 2 farm cooperatives, goes to private utilities.

The waters that are impounded in the Colorado by the dams at Hoover, Parker, and Davis are used for irrigation and domestic purposes, which is the primary use under the Colorado compact.

The waters impounded in those dams in the upper Colorado will not be diverted to irrigation except in one small instance on the Navaho project, but will be impounded for power purposes alone. The water they talk about needing can be diverted now from the river above the dam sites. These are some of the important points that I hope you will consider when you vote on this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] has told you of the legal position of the State of California seeking for clarification of the compact. I cannot go into that because time does not allow me to do so.

Now, let us look at the soil-bank proposal. The administration is asking for 40 million acres to be withdrawn and put into the soil bank with a subsidy to be paid to the farmers. A recent survey of the United States Conservation Service shows that we have 21 million acres of idle land in the United States today that with proper drainage in some instances, and in some instances with no drainage at all, but in all instances in need of fertilization and a few things like that, which would cost much less than $100 an acre, can be brought into production. But here you are paying up to $5,000 an acre to bring 132,000 acres of new farmland and to give additional water to some 260,000 that now are in cultivation.

The statement is made that these will not be surplus crops, but here I have every project which is in the hearings and the testimony of the United States reclamation work which shows that the following crops—small grains, dairy cows, sheep, and sugar beets are all in the category of crop allocation or in the category of crop subsidies or commodity subsidies. Believe me, those lands will be used for those purposes. They tell you that they may only use it for alfalfa, but alfalfa feeds dairy cows and it feeds sheep, and in both instances you have a subsidy problem in those categories.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time. I know pretty well the trend of the House. When the legislative juggernaut engineered by the majority leadership and the minority leadership gets into motion, it pretty well quashes the Members who are opposing the legislation. I have no illusions as to how this bill is going to go. But I opposed projects of this sort before that were giveaways. This is the biggest giveaway of all, $453,974,000 to build a plant to make power for private utilities. In other words, the Federal Government, the taxpayers of your State and mine, buy the cow, and the cream and milk go to the private utility companies and they water it down so that the public does not get the benefit of cheap power but pays through the nose for power generated in plants which their taxes built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. He has been my personal friend for over a third of a century. Is it not true that you were attorney general for the State of Colorado during the proceedings leading up to the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I was attorney general from 1936 to 1941, and dealt with the representatives from southern California in working out the terms and conditions of the Boulder Canyon Act as passed by this Congress in 1940.

Mr. ASPINALL. And before coming to Congress you served as State counsel for the REA?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that this 6-mill power is all going to be bought and paid for by the people of the upper basin States?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. So if there is any complaint about the rate we are paying, we are the people who are paying for it, and it is going back to pay for this project?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say that under no circumstances is this a giveaway in any manner whatsoever. It has a preference clause. There is $145 million in this bill for transmission lines. We have no fear but whatever the REA and every individual who has a right under the preference clause as provided in the reclamation law will get his part.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not also a fact that the water which belongs to the upper basin States, and which would go to the building of this project, is now going to waste in the Pacific Ocean, and as it passes over the turbines at Hoover Dam it is producing secondary power at approximately 1½ mills, which goes as a subsidy to southern California?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may state that the record indicates that over 200 million acre-feet of water has passed into the Pacific Ocean in the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to recommend the adoption of H. R. 3383, known as the upper Colorado bill. This is another forward step in the development of the Colorado River. The watershed of this river is composed of seven States, which constitute approximately one-tenth of the area of the United States.

The Colorado River development began at the turn of the century. At that time engineers and forward-looking citizens envisioned the proper development of the United States. Studies were made of the potential flood control, electrical power, and the proper application of water throughout this entire area. The Congress of the United States authorized the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to enter into a compact respecting the disposition and the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River, August 19, 1921—Forty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 171.

The Honorable Herbert Hoover was appointed by the President of the United States as a representative of the United States of America to confer with these States and arrive at a decision. None of you need to be reminded that under the leadership of the Honorable Herbert Hoover all of the States gathered around the table and adopted the Colorado River compact. This compact envisioned the proper development of the river in all of the States gathered at this table, and it was with the hope that all of the States could work together and develop the West. I need not point out to you that all of the States believed in the future development of the western half of the United States and all cooperated with the idea this could be accomplished by the efforts of the States with assistance from the United States Government.

This legislation is only one part of the plan for the development of the Colorado River. It is to be developed according to the reclamation law. This law was first enacted in 1902. Without the reclamation law the great West could never have developed and contributed to the Nation as it has in the past 50 years. The reclamation law is not designed to provide subsidies, but, on the contrary, it provides a definite method for repayment of advances made. In this instance there will be 99-percent repayment, and the small 1 percent is allocated to flood control and wildlife.

This legislation, when approved, will cause to be generated electricity for use in an expanding and growing area. The electrical energy will be sold under the provisions of the reclamation law which includes the preference clause. There is no power policy issue in this project. The power will be sold at competitive rates, and the users of the power will contribute to the project cost.

I believe that all proper-thinking individuals are interested in the development of our natural resources. This development cannot come all at once and must be taken in stages. This is not the first development on the Colorado River, and we who favor this legislation are somewhat preplexed at the opposition advanced against the development of this river. Why there should come such vehement opposition from those who have received the most out of this development is not understandable.

Permit me to direct your attention to the facts concerning the development of this river. When the Colorado River compact was ratified, the great State of California agreed irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and the six ratifying States at that time that the aggregae annual consumption—diversion less return to river—of water of and from the Colorado River for use in the State of California shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of that water apportioned to the lower basin plus one-half of the surplus. With these limitations, southern California, and particularly the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan water district together with all other contracting bodies, agreed to the terms and conditions of the compact and entered into contracts with the United States Government to repay the cost for the construction of the Hoover Dam and many other reclamation projects, less a $25 million subsidy for flood control.

These firm contracts were based upon the competitive steam-power rates in that area of approximately 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those desiring the water were given contracts at 25 cents per acre-foot. Then southern California, realizing that if she paid the rate under her firm contracts she would repay in less than 50 years, insisted that development be had in the upper basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. When the Boulder Canyon project was amended, then southern California began to pay not 5 or 6 mills per kilowatt-hour but is now paying an average of 2¼ mills per kilowatt-hour. She also reduced the interest rate. It is estimated she had a complete savings far in excess of $5 million a year. When the Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved at the insistence of all of southern California there was made available one-half million dollars a year for a 20-year period to the upper basin States for study and investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and for other purposes.

With the moneys made available, the Bureau of Reclamation has for many years made a complete study in the upper basin States. This study revealed the amount of water that was available and selected sites for construction of power units. The study further reflected that sufficient income could be realized from these projects to pay their own way under the reclamation law. We, in the upper basin States, have waited for years for the Bureau to finish its study, and having finished its study and made its recommendations on a sound basis, we believe we are entitled to the development not only for our own area but for the benefit of the entire United States.

Since southern California has received an advantageous position by its contracts with the United States Government and developed its area far beyond its own expectations, we are at a loss to understand why they would oppose development which they, themselves, had advocated for years until this legislation was presented. As I have heretofore pointed out, they cannot lose any water because they, themselves, enacted the legislation which limits them to 4,400,000 acre-feet and one-half of the surplus. Studies reveal the upper basin States have by the compact agreed that over a 10-year period they are bound to deliver 75 million acre-feet of water, and certainly Southern California will at all times secure its just portion thereof.

Not once in all of the years of negotiation between the upper basin States and southern California was it ever indicated that they would in any manner oppose the proper development of the river. On the contrary, they held out many glowing promises and even suggested the funds for the studies and surveys as set forth in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of June 19, 1940, Fifty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 774.

After southern California had secured their advantageous position and deserted their friends who had helped them secure this position, they set about a campaign of vilification, misrepresentations and untruths, the like of which Hollywood could never expect to equal. Many of you have reached pamphlets and literature indicating what it would cost your particular State or your particular county based upon some fantastic figure pulled out of the air without any regard to the true facts. Those who prepared this literature well know that the Reclamation Law provides for repayment, and I dare you to consult any of their literature where at any time they mentioned this fact.

Can it be that those in southern California are fearful that their advantageous position will be disturbed or if it is not disturbed that they will fail to get all of the water from this river and the electrical energy generated therefrom. When a fair division has been made, why should they object now to others developing? The only answer is that they are not satisfied with misrepresenting themselves to the other States but can only be satisfied when they have secured everything from the river of which they contribute no part of the flow.

A fair analysis of this bill will show that it is good legislation. The unfair and derogatory innuendos are not based upon fact. If you are interested in the development of the western part of the United States, and property of the entire Nation, then I hope that all of you will be fair and honest and properly consider the sources from which this opposition comes and vote for this bill.

Heretofore there has been a great deal of discussion advocated by those from southern California who say that they will be hurt by this legislation and that they are opposing it for that purpose. The first point I would like to make is that without the aid and assistance from those of southern California, this bill would not be here today. Second, I want to point out that it was their aid and assistance that made it possible, and we in Colorado, being on the mountain top of the Continental Divide, having rivers running in every direction, have been besieged with lawsuits from States all around us from the beginning of time. In 1921 when southern California came to us with a little olive branch of peace and a white dove of love and suggested to us that we settle these difficulties, we in Colorado joined with them and came to Congress and authorized the States to get together in a compact. The President of the United States appointed Hon. Herbert Hoover as the representative from the United States.

We sat down at Santa Fe, N. Mex. and wrote the Colorado River compact. It so happened at that particular time that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and I were in law school and our teacher on water rights was a representative to this meeting; he was the representative of the State of Colorado. He sat with these people, and with the Honorable Herbert Hoover to consider the terms and conditions of this compact. It was from him that we learned of the good intentions of those of southern California and all of the upper basin States to settle our differences amicably.

Following that all of the States, with the exception of the State of Arizona, ratified this compact. Arizona apparently began to see the will of the way of those who professed to be our friends at that time and who professed to be our friends until this bill came on the floor of the House. Apparently when they looked out and saw that dove of love they called it a buzzard, because it was their failure to ratify the compact that caused southern California to come back to this Congress and pass the so-called Boulder Canyon Project Act.

I want to direct your attention to the provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, section 13 (a), which provides that before this Hoover Dam can be constructed the State of California should pass a limitation act whereby they agree that under no circumstances will they consumptively use in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River.

Now, mind you, Mr. Chairman, the State of California has not contributed and does not contribute today one drop of water to the Colorado River. Seventy-two percent of this water rises in the State of Colorado and flows down that way. With that being the situation and with the California State Legislature passing its statutes of limitation, the President of the United States proclaimed as provided in the Boulder Canyon Act how we should proceed.

Contracts were entered into for the construction of the Hoover Dam and every one of those contracts stated that it was made subject to the provisions of the compact. If there is any doubt about it I have the complete list of all the contracts that were entered into and that contain that provision.

Let us examine this a little further. In the compact provision of the upper basin States they said Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico constituted the upper basin States; that the lower basin States constituted Nevada, Arizona, and California.

At the time they wrote the compact the engineering data showed that there were approximately 17 to 20 million acre-feet annually in this river. In order to be safe they said that those in the upper basin States would be entitled in perpetuity, mind you, in perpetuity, to 7,500,000 acre-feet; that those in the lower basin States would be entitled to an equal amount.

They then put into that compact a provision which I believe is unfair but nevertheless we of the upper basin States are obligated and have a burden to deliver over a 10-year period to the lower basin States 75 million acre-feet of water.

After these contracts had been entered into with the United States Government and, incidentally, they were to pay 6 mills for the production of power—is when California came to us again with an olive branch of peace and the white dove of love and said: "We want to get away from this contract. We want you to develop it."

For over 4 years all of the States sat together and finally agreed that the Boulder Canyon project Act should be amended. I want to point out to the Members of this House that there was the time that southern California agreed that pursuant to section 2 (d) of the amended Boulder Canyon project, after 1940 a half million dollars a year was made available to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of conducting a study to see how we could develop in the upper basin States.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, at the same time the southern California group came to Congress and we joined with them and a half million dollars was made available to the upper basin States for 20 years. That act also provided for an additional half million dollars a year for 30 years for the full development of all the basin. For the first 20 years $10 million was given to the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of making a study. It was at the suggestion of those from south-

ern California that it was put into legislation because they recognized, as I pointed out before, that they did not have any water. None of it originated in their State. They recognized that their only right was under this compact. They recognized that we were entitled to develop it. It was with that in mind that in 1946 and 1947 the State of California was asked to comment on our development. They did comment, and with a few reservations approved and went along with the right to develop as was contemplated all the time.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as has been stated on the floor of the House by the chairman of this committee, made a complete and fair study. From that study certain recommendations were made and in those recommendations it was found that the projects in this bill are feasible.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. And that was after a factual summary of the amount of water that is in the river and a finding of dependence upon that flow of water, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

In addition to that I might point out to you of southern California who are so visiously fighting this bill: Did it ever occur to you that by the storage of the water in the upper basins and these reservoirs we would be in a better position to continue to deliver the 75 million acre-feet over a 10-year period? Is it not insurance to you to know that stored away up the river is plenty of water to run down to Hoover Dam and to supply the municipal water to the city of Los Angeles? Do you not know that if it is there stored it is then made available to you and why should you object to us developing it?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. May I say to the gentleman that water upstream above Lee Ferry will not affect the generation of power at Hoover Dam or will not put any water on the soil of southern California. We are concerned with the availability of this water.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman that we both know that water runs downhill. It comes down the Colorado River and the only way it is going to get to Hoover Dam, the only way it is going to get to Los Angeles, is as it comes on down. If it is being used there to generate electricity, the gentleman and I know there is very little water lost when used in the generation of electricity. You and I know that in this bill we cannot, under any circumstances, go ahead and use water to the extent that southern California has. Why would you not be satisfied and let us have a little bit of the supply we get from these high mountain ravines, up and down, and then when we are finished with it, make the beneficial uses we can, pass it on to you so that you may have it? Why would you not want to join with us and get more yourself?

Mr. HOSMER. Of course, the gentleman understands fully, does he not, that not one single drop of storage upstream is needed in order to make the beneficial consumptive uses of water which the upper basin desires to use under the project proposed and inserted in this bill and that therefore——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Just a moment. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. The only thing I can say to the gentleman is that I do not understand his mathematics nor the water conservation that he advocates, because any person will recognize and he should know that far above, a mile high, where this water starts, it goes downstream, and if you have dams and reservoirs in which to impound it and run it through the electrical turbines, it is still in the river and will still go down to you, and it will help regulate the flow. I regret that after all these years, when we had what we thought was a fair group working with us for the proper protection of the entire West, we now run into opposition that is not understandable and that the dove of love is that of a vulture nature.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the word "expert" kicked around a bit here and perhaps it has lost its meaning. However, in that I have complete confidence in the ability of the Members to separate the wheat from the chaff, I would like to make reference to some commentary from a man, not only a water engineer but one who has dedicated his life to the study of the Colorado River. More than this, Mr. Merriell, of whom I am speaking, was one of the members of the commission which negotiated the Sante Fe compact which is often raised in these proceedings. I have thus in part only introduced my expert. He is no late comer to the Colorado controversy nor has he parlayed his knowledge of the subject into publicity. It grieves me somewhat that new Members of this body, only recently citizens of the area for which they speak with such fervor and knowledge, are constrained to sell their sudden knowledge as final in determining the merits of a matter at least as old as they in total years and far older than their personal relationship with it.

Still, recent acquaintance with a problem often leads an unsuspecting candor to emerge. My colleague from southern California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] thus, no doubt without knowing its impact, said:

> It is this real invasion of water rights necessary to support a growing civilization now numbering over 6 million people which we cannot countenance. California's legal rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act—

And here he carefully omitted the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act and the California Self-Limitation Act—are at the heart of California's opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project as proposed in the pending bill.

I am glad he saw fit to bare this confession, yet he knew not what he said. In the first place, this legislation requires, and allows suit if it does not obtain strict adherence to all the law of the river. This legal stipulation alone illuminates the need for recourse to vast campaigns directed not to the facts but to the pursuasion of the jury. The Supreme Court has clearly held that there is no justiciable issue as between southern California and the rights of the upper basin States as regard this project. It does not improve his case to argue it with fine words and phrases. We have, of course, explained this before, just as we have met all other arguments, but I wish to make it clear that from the very first, that is way back about the turn of the century, we have entered negotiations to protect all rights under law, not only California but the other States as well. We do not propose here to abandon a half-century of policy and every bill we have considered, including the present one, so stipulates. Justice is served in the bill, but not by assertive statement directed to preconceived positions.

But to get back to one of the truly top men on matters affecting the Colorado River, Mr. Merriell, of Colorado. In his testimony last year before our committee, he spelled out how the rights of California are served, both by the law of the river and by actions of California herself. He shows, and I invite your attention to it for the real factual meat it contains, that her interests are better served by the river law and by our plans than they are by her own actions:

STATEMENT OF F. C. MERRIELL, CHIEF ENGINEER, COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

It seems very necessary to explain to the subcommittee why upper-basin people, especially those from western Colorado, are sure they must have the storage project, in its main outlines, as quickly as it can be put to work.

During the negotiations which preceded the drafting of the 1922 compact by the Colorado River Commission, one member of that commission had a fixed determination to secure for the people of the lower basin a firm guaranty of Colorado River flow to the lower basin. Mr. Norviel, of Arizona, did not at any time desist from his determination to secure such a guaranty and he was, in the end, successful.

The primary reason upper-basin people feel they must have the storage project is to counteract the deleterious effect of that guaranty in the 1922 compact upon the upper basin. To explain that effect certain terms used in hydrology must be defined. The most commonly known tool of the practicing hydrologist is a record of flow taken at some point on any stream where it is believed it will later have value, by standard methods with as great accuracy as possible. This record, which should cover as many years as it can, is, in the West, known as historical flow and sets up for some time unit, such as days, months, or years, the actual delivery of water past the point chosen on the stream. Another quantity which also appears in this analysis, and is also highly important is not the actual flow, but the hypothetical flow that would have occurred at the time the historical flow was

measured, if there had been no use of any kind by men at any place above the point of measurement. This is called the virgin, or undepleted flow, and for the solution of many legal questions in water supply it often is more important than historical flow.

All members of the Colorado River Commission were agreed shortly after sessions were started that the probable average annual virgin flow of Colorado River, in the vicinity of Lee Ferry, at which point they decided to divide the Colorado River Basin into upper basin and lower basin, had for some years been and would continue to be, about 20 million acre-feet annually. They determined to divide at that time 15 million acre-feet evenly between the 2 basins, leaving what they conceived to be a considerable surplus for later division. In an effort to lessen the danger that was inherent in the guaranty of water to the lower basin, the commissioner for Colorado, Delph E. Carpenter, introduced in article III (d), of the compact the provision that the guaranteed amount of water should not be determined on an annual basis, but should be spread over periods of 10 years.

In the light of these facts it is essential to analyze, if that is possible, the reason for the opposition to the storage project of California water bodies, and of some of the State's Representatives in the Congress. Evidently, it is thought in California that its ability, without the storage project, to get the water allotted to the lower basin together with all the water allotted to the upper basin which that basin is not using, so far as it is present in the river, will enable California to secure and use for power much more water than as though the storage project were in existence. That this will be advantageous to California may not necessarily be true, and the history of storage and use of water in Lake Mead shows the point.

After storage was started in Lake Mead February 1, 1935, the lake was filled as quickly as possible and by summer of 1941 it was actually full. From that time until the end of 1952, Lake Mead has been operated as a full reservoir, which does not mean that there were not considerable annual variations of its content and power head, but that these were at all times the maximum possible in view of the flood-stage criteria laid down for that reservoir. This insured the maximum generation of power and a very large supply of water through 1952.

During 1953–54 the production of power was continued at about the same rate as had been possible with a full reservoir every year, in spite of the fact that the reservoir was rapidly being emptied because of the low inflow in both these years. As a result it was necessary in 1954 to cut power production by about 12 percent and on January 31, 1955, the content of Lake Mead was only 12,305,000 acre-feet, less than the reservoir had contained since it was first filled, when it passed this content in June 1937. At this level there is a decrease in power head of 34 percent of the maximum power head and perhaps 30 percent of the average power head as it has been operated for so many years. With the decrease in power head the quantity of water being released must be increased to the maximum usable at the power head available to generate constantly decreasing increments of power. The only remedy under these conditions would have been sooner to reduce the output in order to conserve power head and secure more efficient operation.

If, on the other hand, the storage project has been even partially built and were working during these years, the operation of Lake Mead would not have been greatly different during these 2 years than it had usually been and the reservoir would have been much more nearly full than it now is. If the present prospect of a fair water year in 1955 had been added to the regulation effected by the storage project, 1955 would have been in Lake Mead a year of essentially full-reservoir operation, whereas without the storage project even a very good year must be one of several such to restore the operating conditions that were so successfully maintained from 1941 through 1952. In other words, it would appear that the most efficient operation of Lake Mead will be assured only if there is regulation of this highly erratic river in the upper basin. It is a remarkable confirmation of this idea that during the months of negotiations of the Colorado River Commission, all the commissioners from both basins many times repeated their conviction that for the successful utilization of Colorado River, reservoir regulation must sooner or later be carried out in the upper basin.

Several advantages in addition to that just explained will accrue to the lower basin. The building of reservoirs in the upper basin will much lessen, although not entirely stop, the addition of silt to the loss of capacity Lake Mead has already experienced. Silt entering Lake Mead is not all deposited in the dead-storage space which is ostensibly where it should ultimately be found. Now much of it is in the live-storage space and that will always be true. This silt will neither generate power nor irrigate land, but insofar as it is part of the flow delivered to Lake Mead under natural conditions, it is measured as water, which it certainly is not.

When reservoirs have been built in the upper basin the necessity to carry empty several million acre-feet of storage capacity for possible floods can be largely eliminated. While floods are more apt to occur in the type of country composing the lower basin, it is hardly conceivable that they will require so much flood storage as is now provided, and the level of Lake Mead can be raised with profit in power production by reason of the flood protection of the upper basin reservoirs. That this protection for a most remote possibility does not lessen its necessity, means that somewhere on the river system these protective measures must be enforced.

The effect of all the factors discussed may now be assessed in western Colorado. It must first be said that all the water produced in that State, which is 70 percent of the total yield of the river, has as its first call the delivery of two-thirds of it to meet the obligation of the guaranty at Lee Ferry. In the table that accompanies this memorandum, which starts with listing of the historical flow at Lee Ferry, it is shown how the virgin flow is derived by the addition of all the various forms of consumptive use as nearly as these can be worked out. It is then necessary to deduct the amount guaranteed the lower basin and what remains is the water available for consumptive use in the upper basin. This amount, according to the 1922 compact, should be 7,500,000 acre-feet but as shown in column 11 of the table is reduced, by low-river flow to 5,866,760 acre-feet, as an average for the period, 1950–54. It varies from a yearly negative amount of 1,806,600 acre-feet in 1934, to amounts which in 9 years of the 25 are more than the upper-basin allotment, as already stated, total in the period some 20,350,300 acre-feet. But in all the other years of the period the flow is less, by considerable amounts, than the water the upper basin is supposed to have and varies very widely from year to year.

Analysis of flow, Colorado River at Lee Ferry, 1930 to 1954, inclusive

Year	Historical flow [1]	Diversions [1]		Municipal supply [1]	Irrigation			Virgin flow [1]	Lower basin [1]	Upper basin [1]	Colorado proportion [1]
		Colorado	Utah		Acres [2]	Acre-feet per acre	Total [1]				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1930	13,070.0	22.3	65.0	10.0	1,380	1.19	1,642.0	14,809.3	7,500	7,309.3	3,757.7
1931	6,388.0	16.0	35.0	10.0	1,380	.91	1,255.8	7,704.8	7,500	204.8	106.0
1932	15,290.0	26.6	45.0	10.5	1,380	1.27	1,752.6	17,124.7	7,500	9,624.7	4,954.9
1933	9,745.0	23.6	60.5	11.0	1,380	1.04	1,435.2	11,275.3	7,500	3,776.3	1,922.8
1934	4,397.0	16.8	83.0	11.0	1,380	.82	1,131.6	5,639.4	7,500	−1,860.6	−934.9
1935	9,911.0	41.6	54.5	11.5	1,385	1.05	1,454.3	11,472.9	7,500	3,972.9	2,030.1
1936	11,970.0	73.2	52.0	11.5	1,390	1.13	1,570.7	13,677.4	7,500	6,177.4	3,170.9
1937	11,900.0	78.5	59.2	12.0	1,395	1.13	1,576.3	13,626.0	7,500	6,136.0	3,144.3
1938	15,440.0	129.3	65.8	12.0	1,400	1.28	1,792.0	17,439.1	7,500	9,939.1	5,117.6
1939	9,394.0	99.9	63.8	12.5	1,410	1.04	1,466.4	11,036.6	7,500	3,536.6	1,804.3
1940	7,082.0	92.6	65.8	13.0	1,425	.94	1,339.5	8,592.9	7,500	1,092.9	539.7
1941	16,050.0	111.6	52.9	13.5	1,440	1.31	1,886.4	18,114.4	7,500	10,601.4	5,460.3
1942	17,030.0	51.0	64.2	14.0	1,455	1.34	1,949.7	19,108.9	7,500	11,608.9	5,981.7
1943	11,260.0	115.6	69.1	14.5	1,470	1.11	1,631.7	13,090.9	7,500	5,590.9	2,867.4
1944	13,220.0	80.2	68.0	15.0	1,485	1.20	1,782.0	15,099.2	7,500	7,599.2	3,906.7
1945	11,540.0	128.4	58.2	15.5	1,500	1.13	1,995.0	13,437.1	7,500	5,937.1	3,046.6
1946	8,744.0	114.4	61.0	16.0	1,520	1.02	1,550.4	10,505.8	7,500	3,005.8	1,529.6
1947	13,510.0	101.5	69.8	16.5	1,540	1.21	1,863.4	15,561.2	7,500	8,061.2	4,145.8
1948	13,690.0	84.7	86.4	17.0	1,570	1.21	1,899.7	15,788.0	7,500	8,278.0	4,258.0
1949	14,360.0	109.1	63.3	17.5	1,600	1.22	1,952.0	16,501.9	7,500	9,001.9	4,672.6
1950	11,060.0	125.1	81.3	18.0	1,630	1.11	1,809.3	13,093.7	7,500	5,593.7	2,868.9
1951	9,830.9	185.2	82.0	18.5	1,660	1.05	1,743.0	11,859.6	7,500	4,359.6	2,230.2
1952	17,978.9	185.6	70.0	19.0	1,690	1.36	2,298.4	20,523.9	7,500	13,032.9	6,718.7
1953	8,804.6	300.3	65.0	19.5	1,710	1.02	1,744.2	10,923.6	7,500	3,432.6	1,751.0
1954	6,101.1	378.7	55.6	20.0	1,730	.90	1,557.0	8,112.4	7,500	612.4	291.0

[1] 1,000 acre-feet.
[2] 1,000 acres.

(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(8)=(9). (9)−(10)=(11). (11)×51.75 percent=(12).

By comparing column 12 with the tabulation of "present consumptive use," on page 7, it will appear that in 8 years out of 25 the Colorado proportion of water available for use is less than the present demand, which is bound to grow rapidly in the next few years. This is the very situation the storage project is intended to ameliorate and perhaps cure. Nothing about this use of water by the storage project is contrary to the provisions of the 1922 compact, and as a matter of fact, the Colorado River Commission, although it did not express this in the 1922 compact, had in mind at all times that some project, similar to the storage project, would be a necessity in the upper basin.

Of the water which is the upper basin allotment, Colorado is supposed to have 51.75 percent of 7,500,000 acre-feet less 50,000 acre-feet allotted to Arizona, or 3,855,375 acre-feet. In column 12 of the table shown the actual water available for consumptive use within Colorado, which averages 3,015,240 acre-feet, but in 12 years of the period the

water actually available is less than the average, as shown in the following tabulation:

	Water (acre-feet)
1931	105,500
1933	1,927,800
1934	934,900
1935	2,030,100
1939	1,804,300
1940	539,700
1943	2,867,400
1946	1,529,600
1950	2,868,900
1951	2,230,200
1953	1,751,000
1954	291,000

while in only 4 years of the period is the amount of water more than the average for the period, although less than the compact allotment for Colorado.

Without the storage project the figure for the average water available has no meaning for the water that can actually be used in western Colorado is not the average but only the water actually available in each year, which as the tabulation above shows would be entirely inadequate in 5 years out of the 12 listed and would seriously hamper the raising of crops in all of these years.

It only remains to list the present uses in western Colorado with a fair evaluation of future uses, which are now rapidly developing, to show that in western Colorado necessity for the storage project is much greater than anywhere else in the upper basin, and that even present uses in western Colorado will be seriously hampered if the erratic flow of the river produces many more years of flow as low as it was in 1931, 1934, 1940, and 1954.

You may judge for yourself. The waterflow into Lake Mead has been adequate for required uses in the lower basin, yet it is now dangerously low. We propose, as this shows, to do better by them than they now do by themselves. We will thus help them achieve their own goals in spite of their own contrary efforts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I shall address myself exclusively to this problem of surplus commodities. The gentleman from California about 15 minutes ago referred to this question.

The first question he asked was why have a soil bank and take acreages out of production and then bring in reclamation projects to put acreages into production. I would like to answer that question. The reason is simple. The soil-bank feature, especially the acreage reserve part of it, expires in 1959. It is a temporary affair, and it is fully planned by the department that production and consumption will be in balance in 3 to 5 years. That is why it is temporary.

The gentleman referred in the second place to the production of dairy products in the upper basin States saying that they would add to the surplus problem. Let me give you the most recent statistics from the Department of Agriculture concerning the amount of surplus dairy products in the hands of the CCC right now.

In 1953 we had 256,900,000 pounds of butter; in 1954, 264 million pounds. At the end of last year, 2 months ago, we had only 47 million pounds of butter; it is vanishing at a rapid rate. Now, you take your dried milk. In 1953 we had 432 million pounds; in 1954, 91 million pounds; now 3 million pounds. In other words, supply and demand are almost in balance through our new agricultural program as far as dairy products are concerned and it is reasonable to assume with the USDA that other commodities can be brought into balance in 3 to 5 years. I take as my thesis the fact that this project will not aggravate the surplus problem for the following reasons.

First, it brings in only 132,000 new acres of land.

Second, the 4 upper basin States take out of production many times more than 132,000 acres of new land every 10 years. This project will not be in full production for probably 20 to 27 years, so there will be more land coming out of production in the 4 upper basin States than would go into production. It comes out for urban development, roads, and other purposes with which you are familiar.

Third, the Bureau of the Census gives us an estimate of population by 1975, when this project comes into full production, of 228 million people. That is an increase of 40 percent. If we increase acreage by 40 percent, that would take 161 million more acres. But the Department said improved methods would make that unnecessary, that we would need possibly only 100 million acres. Improved methods of farming will offset millions of acres.

Mark you this second point. We get 20 million acres through reclaiming humid lands and bringing into production lands in nonirrigated areas. These are the lands which the opposition say we should use first. We will need all that, and more, too, and still we will be 10 million acres short. It will take 35 million acres by that time to produce the meat we need because meat consumption by that time will be 49 percent above the present. That is largely what we produce under the Colorado project.

In the fourth place, the Colorado project will reduce surpluses, not increase them. You may ask me, how do I come to that conclusion? Here is the whole story. It is assumed by the opposition that if dams on the Colorado project are not built, no land will come into production. That is a great fallacy. If these dams are not built thousands of acres of new land will come into production in the Imperial Valley and in Mexico. And that is where they really are producing the surplus commodities. That is where they are producing surplus commodities on our water right now. If you want more surpluses, just let the water run down the river. If you do not want surpluses, then let us use it in the upper basin and insure the use of it to the upper basin States. Congress has decreed that these States are the rightful owners.

My available time on the floor has come to an end. However, I am submitting the following statement as an extension of my remarks to provide elaboration and substantiation of the position that construction of the upper Colorado project will not affect our current surplus problem.

First, the new land to be brought under cultivation is only 132,360 acres and that will not be in full production until 1975. This 132,360 acres is a far cry from the "million acres of land which the gigantic upper Colorado River project and its satellite, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would bring into production"—I quote from the release of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Monday, January 23, 1956.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas brings in no new acres, and the Colorado only 132,000.

The Washita project in Oklahoma which we were pleased to vote out last week without an opposing vote will bring in nearly a third—41,000—as many new acres as the Colorado. The Ventura project sponsored by southern California will bring into production 12,600 acres at a cost of $1,216 per acre and an annual pumping cost of $50 per acre. It is in a highly developed urban area and it is worth it. Many of the reasons that make the Ventura project desirable also make the Colorado project desirable. Repayment features are the same in both projects.

Why then such a roar about the Colorado and surpluses? The reason is not surpluses. We must go deeper than surpluses. The real reason is that southern California is making a pass at the upper basin States' share of the water which the lower basin States and Congress decreed to the lower basin in the law of the river—1922.

Second, increased population will bring increased demands. Our population is growing at a staggering rate. Official reports by experts indicate that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce.

Population is increasing at a rate of approximately 2,800,000 each year. Assuming present rate of increase continues, the United States Census Bureau estimates the population by 1975, when the project approaches full production, at 228 million. Four other predictions place the population between 209 and 250 million. The Census Bureau estimate is an increase of 40 percent by 1975.

There are 409 million acres of cropland in the United States at the present time. If the needed increase in acreage were equal to the increase in population—41 percent—we would need 161 million more acres by 1975. Of course, this figure is high because of increasing productivity. In any case, conservative estimates indicate that we will need the equivalent of 100 million new acres. The USDA says the United States will need 40 percent more overall food production by 1975 and that one of the commodities in greatest demand will be livestock, with an increased requirement for consumption of 49.4 percent.

Byron T. Shaw of USDA testified before the House Committee on Interior Affairs that we will need 35 million new acres by 1962 to produce the forage and feed necessary to maintain the current per capita meat consumption at 156 pounds per person. Livestock is the major crop of the upper basin States. For example, livestock constitutes 70 percent of Utah's agricultural income. The

best estimates as to where the new acres will come from are as follows:

Total sources of new land

	Million acres
Acres offset by improved farming methods	70
Acres obtained by draining and clearing land	20
Total	90
New acres required	100
Acres short	10

The Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture is my authority for saying that the four upper basin States will have more cropland go out of production every 10 years than the entire Colorado project will bring new acres into production in 30 years. This is occasioned by withdrawals for urban development, highways, airports, military reservations, erosion, and other causes.

In addition to the loss of cropland we will be facing in the United States by 1975, it has been found necessary to reduce the numbers of livestock on the national forests and public lands at an alarming rate in order to protect the watersheds which are deteriorating under heavy grazing and drought conditions.

Take, for example, the watersheds in the Heber City, Utah, area, one of the best cattle and sheep ranges in the State. The livestock people are required to remove 20 percent of their cattle and sheep this year, 20 percent next year, and 20 percent the year after, because of the serious condition of the watersheds which sustain a population of 400,000 in the valleys below.

Third, these 132,360 acres will not come into full production until about 1975 and by that time demands for food will far exceed the supply. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation's most recent report, Reclamation and the Crop Surplus Problem, says:

> Responsible officials of the USDA anticipate a balance between production and consumption of agricultural commodities in 3 to 5 years.

This is the reason why the acreage reserve program is to run only to 1959. The Department of Agriculture feels that there will be no need for it after that date.

This is the answer to the opposition's question: "How can the administration on the one hand call for a decrease in acreage allotments through the soil bank and, on the other hand, ask Congress to approve the building of reclamation projects?"

The answer is "the acreage allotment of the soil bank runs only until 1959."

The acreage reserve will expire 6 years before even the Colorado storage dams are completed.

Fourth, a vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses. On the other hand, a vote against the Colorado is a vote to increase surpluses in the basic commodities.

The assumption is fallacious that if the Colorado project is killed the water will not be put to immediate beneficial use in agriculture. On the contrary, this bill is being opposed by a well-heeled southern California lobby chiefly for the reason that they want the water. They know that water runs down hill. They know that unless the upper basin States have the storage dams to impound floodwaters these States can never use the 7½ million acre-feet per year which Congress and even the lower basin States themselves have awarded to them. Therefore, by blocking this measure the upper basin States' share of the water is, and inevitably will be, used by the lower California State and by Mexico.

If used in the upper basin States, the water will not produce, to any appreciable extent, basic commodities that go into Government warehouses under price supports. On the contrary, if the project is not approved by Congress, and hence the water not used by the upper basin States, it will be used by the lower basin States and Mexico to produce basic commodities that are seriously in surplus and do go into the Government warehouses in large amounts.

For example, in 1945—Cotton Branch of Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture—Imperial County had 9 acres of cotton. In 1953 this county had 116,630 acres of cotton. In 1945, San Joaquin County had 317,900 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,182,750. In 1945, all of California had only 319,000 acres of cotton; in 1953, 1,348,000.

What is more alarming to cotton producers of our country, Mexico, with no acreage restrictions, now produces one-half million bales of cotton, all with Colorado water, much of which belongs to the upper basin. California has at least 85,000 additional acres upon which she can grow cotton and other basic commodities. Mexico has many additional acres upon which she can grow cotton with the upper basin States' water on the Colorado River Delta, if upper basin water is allowed to run down to her. Upper basin States can guarantee not to raise 1 pound of cotton under the Colorado project.

This is only one reason why I say "A vote for the Colorado project is a vote to reduce surpluses."

It is important to realize that wheat production in the upper basin will be reduced by construction of the project, since dry farm wheat operations can be expected to be cut from 50 percent to 90 percent in favor of crops which are more economical when irrigation water must be purchased.

SOIL BANK HAS NO BEARING ON THE ISSUE AS NOW PLANNED

The opponents of the Colorado River have said that it is inconsistent to establish a soil bank plan and take land out of production and, on the other hand, to pass the Colorado project. How is this statement erroneous?

The acreage reserve program is to expire in 1959. It is a temporary measure. The United States Department of Agriculture plans to have supply and demand in balance in 3 to 5 years. The Colorado project will not begin to come into any production until years after that time.

The only crop produced in the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which is eligible for the acreage reserve program is wheat, and irrigation water will reduce wheat production.

GRAIN PRODUCED IN UPPER COLORADO BASIN DOES NOT GO UNDER PRICE SUPPORT, BUT IS FOR LOCAL FEED

In 1954, 4,561,635 bushels of corn were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount a mere 440 bushels, or 0.01 percent of the corn produced in these 4 States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $723. Contrast this 440 bushels with the CCC corn inventory of 757,612,049 bushels with a support value of $1,300,322,952. Why such a small amount placed under price support? Because corn is not produced for commercial sale in these four States, but for livestock feed. In fact, none of these four States are even in the designated "commercial corn area" for price purposes.

In 1954, 2,751,961 bushels of wheat were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 402,420 bushels, or 14.6 percent of the wheat produced on reclamation lands were placed under price support at a support value of $864,609. Contrast this 402,420 bushels with the CCC wheat inventory of 888,542,189 bushels with a support value of $2,399,042,201.

In 1954, 5,121,245 bushels of barley were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount only 62,282 bushels, or 1.2 percent of the barley produced in these States on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $63,708. Contrast this 62,282 bushels with the CCC barley inventory of 31,261,403 bushels with a support value of $43,966,463.

In 1954, 2,552,944 bushels of oats were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this amount, an insignificant 9,286 bushels or 0.36 percent of the oats produced on reclamation project lands were placed under price support at a support value of $7,093. Contrast this 9,286 bushels with the CCC oats inventory of 35,258,232 bushels with a support value of $29,987,599.

Why such a small amount placed under price support? Two reasons primarily: First, little acreage is planted to wheat because irrigated land used to produce fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops bring higher returns to farmers; second, most of the wheat produced, as are the other small grains, are fed to livestock.

In 1954, 2,299 bushels of rye were produced on reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Of this insignificant amount only 149 bushels, or 6.5 percent of the rye produced were placed under price support at a support value of $191. Contrast this 149 bushels with the 3,305,906 bushels in the CCC inventory, valued at $5,390,331.

SUMMARY

In summary, then, we have shown that the surplus issue has been distorted all out of proportion to its importance.

First, because the project brings under cultivation only 132,360 new acres. More acres will be taken out of production each decade than will be brought into production by the entire project. This is due to the many acres retired by urban growth, new highways, airports, and so forth.

Second, because these new acres will not be brought into full cultivation until 1975.

Third, that our agricultural demands by 1975 will far exceed our Nation's capacity to produce, and new acres at that time will be an unmitigated blessing.

Fouth, that far more basic commodities now in surplus will be produced if the water is permitted to run down into the lower basin than if it is consumed in the upper basin.

Fifth, that the crops produced in the upper basin States are not to any extent the basic crops that make up the Government surpluses.

Sixth, that the proposed soil bank has no bearing on the issue because the acreage reserve program of the soil bank expires in 1959, long before any acres under the Colorado can be brought into production.

Seventh, that the 20 million acres in non-irrigated sections of the United States which can be reclaimed will be needed before the Colorado project comes into production, in spite of the fact that except for special areas these acres would be limited to the few basic crops which make up the Government surplus.

The real issue is not surpluses, cost engineering, or repayment. The real issue is "Who gets the water?"

I doubt that my colleagues will deny the right of the upper basin States to use their own water and by such action make that water available to lower California and to Mexico.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this project has taken a rather curious turn. One of the speakers just a few minutes ago asked you to support the project because apparently he believes that Californians are a bunch of rascals in their position in this, and their opposition to the project on the basis it uses water of the river to which the lower basin is entitled.

Also, yesterday it was implied that I had quoted some resolutions in the RECORD that did not exist, from certain railway brotherhoods. The statements I put in the RECORD did not identify any particular national organizations. It was stated here apparently that I did state they were national organizations and telegrams were produced from them saying that they had taken no record on this.

As to the organizations to which I referred, I obtained their feelings on the matter by a letter dated March 7, 1955, from Railroad Brotherhoods, California Legislative Board, representing the Brotherhoods of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Railroad Trainmen, Conductors and Brakemen, Locomotive Engineers, Railway Clerks, Railway Carmen, Maintenance of Way Employees; Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Railroad Signalmen, Sheet Metal Workers, National Railway Employees. These are all organizations in California and I neither stated nor intended to imply they were national organizations.

Also I have here a letter from the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the grand lodge in Detroit; another letter from the locomotive engineers out in Sacramento. These will be available if anybody wishes to look at them.

There have been imputations of unworthy motives because of southern California's natural interest in maintaining the physical availability of water to which she has a legal right by urging defeat of the upper Colorado storage scheme.

There have been descriptions of some alleged water lobby, which, by the use of the word "lobby," apparently imply that something not quite proper is afoot. Such an attack is in fact an attack on 6 million southern Californians individually who, working through their own water-supply bodies, both officially and unofficially, are seeking to protect only what is theirs. These bodies are:

First. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, composed of 68 cities including Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego.

Second. Imperial Irrigation District.

Third. Coachella Valley Irrigation District.

Fourth. Palo Verde Irrigation District.

Fifth. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Sixth. San Diego County Water Authority.

There is nothing either sinister or secret about these organizations or the men and women interested in them. Their only concern, and mine, is that southern California not become parched and her future strangled by upstream developments preventing our rightful share of Colorado River water from reaching us.

The attacks being made on us are purely diversionary tactics to take attention away from the merits of our cause and the very real and apparent defects, financial, geological, and engineering, of the upper Colorado River storage proposal.

Particularly offensive to me personally, is the obstinate refusal of project proponents to take into consideration the compound interest costs on money which would have to be borrowed to finance the project and which runs into billions of dollars.

Mention has been made of the Colorado River Association which opposes the upper Colorado scheme. Just what is it?

The Colorado River Association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of citizens from all sections of California and from 43 other States.

Acting in behalf of the Colorado River Board of California and the member agencies of that board, the association is carrying forward an educational program to inform the people of the United States of existing and proposed water and power developments on the lower Colorado River.

Members of the association are representative of business, industry, agriculture, labor, the professions, women's organizations, and numerous civic, patriotic, educational and service groups.

What is the Colorado River Board of California? This is an official California State agency. The board is composed of six members appointed by the Governor. Each member of the board represents a California water and/or power agency with established rights on the Colorado River. These are the public agencies I mentioned above, namely: Coachella Valley County Water District; Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles; Imperial Irrigation District; Palo Verde Irrigation District; San Diego County Water Authority; the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which represents 68 cities, including Long Beach, San Diego, and Los Angeles.

Under provisions of the State law which set forth the powers and duties of the Colorado River Board, it has the responsibility of safeguarding and protecting the rights and interests of the State, its agencies and citizens, in and to their contracted shares of water of the Colorado River system.

The board and the State's public agencies with rights on the river are not seeking to obtain more water from the Colorado River than California's share, but to safeguarding the share of the river's water for which California people, through their public agencies, have long-standing contracts.

There are 6 million people in southern California depending on Colorado River water. The people of this area desperately need the water they are now receiving from the Colorado River system. The 6 million people who must have this water are not asking for water to pour on arid acres in order to raise additional crop surpluses and increase the Nation's tax burden; they are not asking the Government to spend $5 billion to further their own selfish interests; they are not clamoring for the construction of a gigantic water and power system that is at best totally unsound, both from an engineering and economic standpoint; the people of California ask none of these things.

What then is southern California asking? The millions of people in this area are asking only to be allowed to continue their use of water that they must have to carry on normal daily living. This is water to be used in homes, schools, and business. This is water for drinking, washing, and water to meet the normal demands of any giant metropolitan area.

There are twice as many people living in southern California, all of them directly dependent upon water from the Colorado River, than in all of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming combined. In addition, only a small portion of the people in these four States could possibly benefit from the upper Colorado project, while on the other hand, everyone of the 6 million people in the Los Angeles metropolitan water district will suffer equal hardship by the project's completion.

This is a case where millions of people are asking the Government not to waste billions of dollars in order to take away water that they must have to live. This is a plea by the people of southern California for the most basic necessity of life, water.

It is difficult to imagine how Congress, mindful of the best interests of the Nation and with all of the facts so readily available, could presume to pass such a bill. There is only one answer to this type of legislation: decisive and permanent defeat.

I should just like to say that when it comes time to decide whether you are going to vote for the bill or against the bill, ask yourself this. You go back home and some constituent comes up to you and says, "Why did you vote for a bill that would cost over a billion dollars in hidden interest, according to a letter from the Department of the Interior? That is a lot of money when you add it on to the direct appropriation. When you do that, you have voted away almost $2 billions of the taxpayers' money, only $1 billion of which is calculated to come back. Why do you impose those additional taxes on your constituents?" What answer will you give them? What will you say when your constituents say, "Why, you voted for a project that is going to cost $794 an acre to irrigate 160,000 acres of land up in Utah, and the whole project overall will take $545 direct expenditure per acre." What kind of an answer are you going to give them when they ask you that question?

What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent when he comes up to you and says, "I thought this bill had something in it for the Navahos but it has nothing substantial in it for the Navahos. Why did you vote for it?" What kind of an answer are you going to give your constituent?

He might say, "Mr. Congressman, you voted for that bill and it would require power to be sold at 6 mills for the next 100 years, but electric power was not even conceived of 100 years ago." How could you vote on getting the taxpayers' money back on a speculation as far into the future as that?

Another thing your constituent may ask you is, "Mr. Congressman, what about the developments in nuclear electricity? You voted to spend almost half a billion dollars for hydroelectric plants in a day when nuclear developments are taking place."

Those are some of the things you should think of.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the upper Colorado River storage project now under consideration is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. These projects are essential if a large section of our country is to grow and develop to make its full contribution to our expanding national economy. It is vital to the stabilization of the livestock industry of the area. It is essential if the natural resources of this area, which have been rightfully referred to as the "treasure box" of the Nation, are to be developed.

It seems that we recognize the importance of water only when we have too much or too little. Some areas of the Nation have recently suffered from too much water. We of the intermountain West have been sympathetic to their problem as we have been to other sections with the same problem. However, our problem continues to be that of too little water. It is a problem that has continuously confronted us. This has been expensive to the Nation as a whole and a source of catastrophe to the area. In the drought year of 1934, the Federal Government purchased in the State of Wyoming 284,548 head of cattle and 584,976 head of sheep as a relief measure. As least 10 percent of these were slaughtered in the fields because they were in no condition to ship. The Department of Agriculture reports that drought assistance amounted to over $20 million in fiscal year 1954 and over $14 million in fiscal year 1955. In 1 year, over $650,000 was spent in Wyoming for drought relief, primarily for hay. This was at the taxpayers' expense. Better we should be assisted in helping ourselves on a sound basis by getting at the cause of the problem.

The future of our area is directly dependent upon the availability of water through conservation. We have abundant natural resources which the Nation sorely needs. These include uranium, oil shale, oil, gas, coal, titanium, vanadium, phosphorus, iron, trona, forests, and others. Most require water for development. Even in our fondest dreams, we do not see our area as an industrial giant. We will not be taking industry away from any other section. With water, we will serve as a feeder area to supply other parts of the country with many critical raw materials and at the same time will develop as a better market for the finished products.

The number one argument of the opponents of the upper Colorado River project legislation now being considered by the House has been a contention that it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation an enormous sum. I can appreciate how this argument would cause the Representatives of the other States concern. It is an easy way to appeal to the emotional reactions of a tax-conscious electorate. The argument though is not sound and as I shall show you, is based upon fantasy and distortion.

To establish the facts, let us examine the provisions of the bill rather than to talk about something that is not before the House. The bill before the House for consideration, H. R. 3383, authorizes a maximum expenditure of $760 million. The cost estimate of the projects shown by the committee report is in round numbers, $758.8 million.

Of the total cost, only $7.4 million is not reimbursable. This is less than 1 percent of the total cost and represents that portion of the cost assigned to flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation. This is in keeping with the general policy that has been followed over the years and differs from other projects only in that there is such a small amount which is not to be reimbursed. On our other public-works projects such as river and harbors and flood control, not 1 percent but 100 percent is nonreimbursable. Certainly, neither the opponents nor the rest of the Nation can be objecting to this provision in the bill.

Of the remaining $751.4 million, $422.7 million are allocated to power. This entire amount will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. Power revenues will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury after the cost and interest are paid in full.

Another $41 million of the cost is allocated to municipal water uses. Similarly on this feature, not only will the principal be paid in full, but interest will also be paid.

The power and municipal water features encompass more than 61 percent of the total cost of the Colorado project. On this outlay, the taxpayers obviously are not expected to pay a penny.

The remaining $287.7 million authorized is allocated to irrigation. This amount is repayable in full, in 50 years, but does not bear interest. This is in accordance with the Reclamation law, and has been standard practice for the past 54 years. The principle is sound that the irrigation costs should not be expected to pay interest. Yet it is apparently on this fact that the opponents of the upper Colorado project, the most vocal of which have had the greatest benefit from this provision, apparently base their preposterous charges that some fabulous burden of hidden interest will be placed on the Nation's taxpayers. By means of arithmetical mysteries known only to themselves, the opponents have come up with some fantastic figures. One thing is quite obvious that they have assumed expenditures not authorized in this bill to accomplish their purpose. The Members of the House will certainly not fall for this type of argument to discredit this project or the reclamation program in general. This is actually an investment for the Nation as a whole and the Treasury will reap far greater returns on its investment than any theoretical interest charge would amount to.

President Theodore Roosevelt said back in 1901 when a proposal for a reclamation law was under discussion:

> The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States.

The following year, on June 17, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law the first Reclamation Act, and over fifty-odd years since, the truth of his 1901 prediction was proved over and over again.

Through multipurpose reclamation projects, the entire Nation has been enriched by specialty crops not grown elsewhere in the Nation, by the stabilizing of the agricultural economy of a large part of our Nation, by the development of water for growing cities and

growing industries, by the production of hydroelectric power and in taxes paid directly into the Federal Treasury on the new wealth produced—wealth which would never have come into being without the aid of reclamation.

The sum total of these benefits—taking into consideration only the direct and obvious benefits, without regard to the multiple indirect benefits that flow into every corner of our Nation and bolster the economy—is more than 10 times the total of all money that has been invested in reclamation in this country since the beginning of the program in 1902.

As Theodore Roosevelt looked forward in 1901, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power looked back on the 53-year record of reclamation in 1955 and summed it up this way:

> No Federal help or encouragement has been as attractive an investment as irrigation development, or has provided, per unit of expenditure, as great a unit of return in western regional development.

There is a clear difference between wasteful expenditure and sound investment. It is as uneconomic to pass up a sound investment as it is to spend money recklessly and wastefully.

The report of the Hoover Commission task force further stated:

> The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crop, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation.

A folder featuring a map and with banner headline entitled "A New $4 Billion Tax Burden Threatens You" was circulated yesterday among Members of Congress. As I have previously stated, there is no way that we can determine what mathematical mysteries were employed by the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles to develop these figures. This circular does shed some light on the situation. As shown on its face, it assumes 33 participating projects whereas this bill authorizes only 11 participating projects. Therefore, from its very inception, it is not applicable to the bill before us.

There is one other thing that appears on the face of the map which I think should be set straight. The Colorado River Association of Los Angeles in the circular states:

> Costs to States are based on the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C.

The careful wording of this leaves the inference that the Tax Foundation backs up the costs shown for the individual States. This is not the fact. Tax Foundation general estimates of how the Federal tax burden is distributed among States having nothing to do with the costs of this project were applied to the southern California fantasy figures. This was then used to create the inference. The fantastic costs assumed to accomplish the distortion are solely the responsibility of the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles and its associates. I am advised that the Tax Foundation has had to send out many explanatory letters.

It would appear that these people, to arrive at these costs, have entirely disregarded the fact that 61 percent of the expenditure is reimbursed in full with interest. This only leaves $287,700,000 in addition to the $7,400,000 that is nonreimbursable, on which interest is not directly paid back to the Treasury. This amount is repaid in full in 50 years plus the development period. These people certainly cannot expect Congress to accept this argument when one single flood-control project that they have recently asked for and which has been allowed and is presently under construction for the benefit of the city of Los Angeles involves $348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. I refer to the Los Angeles County drainage area project in southern California, which, excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir, is estimated to involve the $348 million of nonreimbursable Federal funds. These funds are not to be repaid in 50 years; they are never to be repaid. If we were to compound the interest on the Federal money for a period of 100 years on this expenditure for the city of Los Angeles and the surrounding area alone, we could contend that it was costing the taxpayers of the Nation $4,100,000,000. How the opposition could expect us to accept that interest on $295 million, a $53 million lesser amount, which is repaid in annual installments over a shorter period of time, and reach the same figure shows how preposterous their statement really is. But this money, for the benefit of southern California, is never repaid. If we were to continue compounding the interest for 200 years, a figure of $48 billion on this project alone could be developed. It is obvious that, by such ridiculous computations, it could then be contended that this one project, for the benefit of southern California only, would eventually be responsible for the entire national debt, and, for that matter, would bankrupt the Nation. The same line of false reasoning could be developed for any flood-control project in the United States. Obviously the conclusion is not true and southern California representatives would undoubtedly be the first ones to object. Our interest in rivers and harbors improvements and in flood control are not bankrupting us, as we all know. This is because it is an investment and not an expenditure on which we get no return. A sound investment, whether an improvement of navigation facilities, in flood control, or in reclamation, builds up the national economy.

Let us now take a close look at the interest-free money allocated to the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project. We will see why this will not create a burden on the taxpayer, but will, rather, considerably ease the taxpayers' effort.

The surest way to judge what will happen on a project which is to be constructed is to check on what has happened on similar projects which have been constructed in the past. In nearly 54 years that the reclamation law has been in effect reclamation projects in the 17 Western States have returned to the Federal Treasury in taxes on the new wealth created over 25 percent more than the total cost of all reclamation construction.

A large number of these projects are not yet completed and therefore have not yet started producing. Many others have only begun to produce. That means that the full costs of the investment have been included, but that the full productive capacity has not been included in computing the return.

When we consider typical reclamation projects that have been in full production for some time, the comparison is even more impressive. The Bureau of Reclamation made a study of 15 reclamation projects that have been in full production over a number of years. It was found that the cumulative Federal income taxes paid from 1916 to 1953 directly attributable to the new wealth created by these projects—taxes that would not have accrued if the projects had not been constructed—totaled approximately 5 times the total cost of construction of the 15 projects. Without these tax revenues the tax burden on the balance of the Nation's taxpayers would have been materially increased. The net result of reclamation has been to substantially ease the taxpayers' burden, not add to it.

The figures I have just quoted relate to all reclamation projects or to samples of typical reclamation projects. There are numerous examples where the return on the investment in tax receipts has been even more startling. The Strawberry project in Utah is in the same area and on the same sort of land as the proposed Colorado River storage project. It was built some 40 years ago at a total construction cost of $3,348,684, of which 75 percent has now been repaid by the direct beneficiaries. The area which it serves was, prior to construction of the project, almost entirely wasteland. The tax return from that land was nil. At the present time 1 year's total of Federal, State, and local taxes on the wealth created by this reclamation project is more than $6 million, of which $4,400,000 goes directly into the Federal Treasury. Thus, each year the taxpayers of the Nation get back more than the entire original investment.

The projects which are proposed to be authorized in this bill have been subjected to close scrutiny by the executive agencies and by the members of the committee. In each instance it has been determined that the benefit to the taxpayers will exceed the cost, even allowing for interest on the full investment.

We thus see that there is no basis for the charge that the projects proposed by this bill will be a drain upon the Nation's taxpayers. Over 61 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended will be repaid in full with interest. Thereafter,

revenues from power and municipal water users will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury. As to the amount allocated to irrigation, the principal would be repaid to the Treasury in equal annual installments in 50 years, plus any development period authorized by law. The interest on the irrigation investment would be offset many times over by direct benefits to the taxpayers—new taxes collected alone would offset many times this theoretic charge. We have not even considered revenues to the Treasury or the benefit to the balance of the Nation from business that would be directly and indirectly generated through this development.

Since the people in the area are paying for these projects again and again by irrigation payments, by power payments, by municipal water payments and by increased Federal taxes, it should neither be expected nor required that they should pay for them again. That they do is the fact under present law. Except for the 11 Western States, the other sister States were granted full and equal status with the Original Thirteen States. In our case, this is not so. We are the so-called public land States. The Federal Government still claims a major portion of our surface. Even on the remaining lands, the Federal Government has reserved the minerals since 1920. In the State of Wyoming the Federal Government holds over 50 percent of the surface and almost 74 percent of the minerals. Under the present law, all of the revenues from the sale of public lands and 52½ percent of the proceeds from mineral leasing, including the royalties, accrue to the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is a revolving fund which by law can be used only for reclamation. At the present time approximately 50 percent of the total annual appropriation for reclamation, including power and municipal water features, comes from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury. By 1965 it is estimated that 73.2 percent of the total appropriations for reclamation will be from the reclamation fund rather than from the general Treasury.

Right today repayments from Wyoming projects and contributions by Wyoming to the reclamation fund exceed the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed for the State of Wyoming. How can anyone argue that this is a burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation? Certainly no one expects to charge us interest on withdrawal of our own deposits from the bank.

Under the present law, and at the present rates of collection, neither principal or interest on the irrigation feature of this bill can ever cost the taxpayer of another State one red cent. This is true because during the actual period of construction, the upper basin States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico will actually contribute more money to the reclamation fund bank than the amount withdrawn for construction of the irrigation features. There can be no "hidden interest" charge on the other States when these four States are depositing more money than the interest-free money which is being withdrawn. To prove the truth of these statements, we shall refer only to contributions by the upper basin States to the reclamation fund from the sale of public land within these States and from proceeds of the Mineral Leasing Act ordinarily referred to as accretions to the fund. Total accretions to the fund for fiscal 1955 were $33,478,656.04. Of this amount, $23.3 million, more than two-thirds, was contributed by the upper basin States. Assuming that the annual accretions remain constant at the 1955 level, under present law, over a 19-year construction period the State of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would contribute to the reclamation fund out of their irreplaceable natural resources the sum of $442.7 million. Not 1 cent of this money comes from the taxpayers of the Nation. The total cost of all projects authorized by this legislation allocated to irrigation is $287.7 million. The period of construction will be as determined by the Congress in making appropriations available. The most rapid period of construction that has been assumed has been over a 19-year period. We thus see that during this 19-year period of construction, the upper basin States would contribute to the reclamation fund from these sources only the full amount of the construction costs for irrigation, plus an additional $155 million. Even under this accelerated construction schedule, at any given year the amount that the four States had contributed to the reclamation fund from the beginning of construction would exceed the cumulative amounts necessary for the construction program. Never would it be necessary that funds for the construction of the irrigation features be taken from the general Treasury.

In this computation, we have assumed that the accretions to the reclamation fund will remain constant at the 1955 rate. This is an ultra-conservative assumption. The fact is that the contributions to the fund, and particularly from these States, have steadily increased during the past several years. If we were to assume annual contributions from these States at the rate which they contributed during the period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955, the annual rate of contribution would be $26.5 million per year. The amount contributed over the 19-year construction period would be $503.5 million and the amount by which contributions would exceed expenditures for construction chargeable to irrigation would be $215.8 million. It is obvious that there can be no hidden interest chargeable to the taxpayers of the Nation. All features of the construction except irrigation are repaid in full with interest. Under present law, these four upper basin States will contribute during the construction phase far more to the reclamation fund than is required for that portion of the construction chargeable to irrigation. This money is to be repaid without interest but it is a case of the four upper basin States financing their project with their own money. No one could contend that interest should be charged. There is no hidden interest. There is no burden on the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation.

Certainly there must be some sense of equity in the heart of southern California. They cannot be so unreasonable as to expect us in the upper basin States to bank their projects from our natural resources without interest and then be heard to complain that we do not pay interest on our own money.

This project is sound. It is self-liquidating. It will not be a burden on the taxpayers. It is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It is essential to the growth and development of the area. With the project, the area can make its full contribution to the Nation through a stabilized economy and full development and delivery of its vital natural resources.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the site of this upper Colorado River project is often referred to as a "treasure chest." Yes, it is a treasure chest. Nature has endowed this area most generously. It contains vast deposits of mineral ores. Hydro power, coal, and uranium are abundantly available to furnish necessary power.

Water, too, is available, but only in limited quantities. The water supply is sufficient to sustain a tremendous population and industrial expansion. But, this is so only if the water is applied to its highest use, human consumptive use and industrial use.

What we decide here, today, will shape the destiny of this segment of the Nation over the next 100 years.

We can go forward and benefit this area by wisely using nature's bounty. This area is destined to produce metals, chemicals, plastics, manufactured and fabricated products. We can transform these lands into an industrial empire comparable to Pittsburgh, Detroit, or the Ruhr Valley.

Or, we can go backward. The allocating of power revenues to irrigation, artificially increases electricity prices. This precludes industrial expansion and produces uneconomic farm surpluses. Water for irrigation is its most wasteful use. This program would relegate the area to a horse and buggy economy for the next 100 years.

The Senate bill, S. 500, passed last summer, contains the minimum goal of the proponents of this bill. This discussion will be confined, in large measure, to the project as is contained in Senate bill 500.

GENERAL SCHEME

Now, let us examine the overall outline of this operation.

This bill creates a holding company known as the upper Colorado Basin

fund. The basin fund would construct and finance the projects and has four general purposes:

The first and primary objective is to construct 33 irrigation projects to cost $628 million.

The second purpose of this bill is to construct $72 million worth of municipal waterworks.

The third objective of this bill is to rehabilitate 1,100 Navaho Indian families by the construction of a dam and irrigation works at a cost of $212 million.

The last and final objective is to furnish a cash register to partially pay for these three dubious speculations. The financial scheme to bail out these first three objectives is to construct 5 dams, with reservoir and powerplants to generate electricity. This would cost an additional $746 million.

The total cost of these 4 ventures is $1,658,000,000.

COST (INITIAL AND ULTIMATE PLANS)

The present bills represent, merely, the initial phase of this proposal. There are more than 100 separate irrigation projects under study for the ultimate and comprehensive upper Colorado project. This ultimate plan would cost an additional minimum of $1,600,000,000 for a grand total of $3,200,000,000.

Based on a national population of 160 million people, this initial phase would cost an average of $10 per person. The additional projects in the ultimate plan would increase the average cost to $20 per person or $7 million for each congressional district.

REPAYMENT PROVISIONS

How does this bill propose to repay the $1,658,000,000 invested by the taxpayers? Repayments are allocated not on costs but on the Reclamation Bureau's estimates of ability to repay.

Six hundred and eight million dollars of allocated power costs would be repayable from power consumption with 2⅞ percent interest.

Seventy-two million dollars of municipal water works would be repayable by water districts with 2⅞ percent interest.

The remaining $1 billion is repayable without interest, on an if and when basis out of possible power revenues, and upon the Reclamation Bureau's guesses as to repayment ability.

The payout period ranges from 50 years in the Senate bill to 120 years on one project under survey.

ANALYSIS

Now, if we analyze this project, here is what we find.

At 2⅞ percent the interest charges on this $1,658,000,000 investment would be $47 million annually, for the Federal taxpayers.

The net revenues of all the power projects is only $22 million per year. The total repayments for both principal and interest from farmers, municipalities and the Navahos is $7,100,000 per year.

The total repayments of $29,100,000 for principal and interest, leaves us with an annual deficit to the taxpayers of $17,900,000, upon interest alone. The principal obligation of $1,658,000,000 can never be repaid.

TAX SUBSIDY

I have a letter, here, from a privately owned utility comparable in size to the Glen Canyon hydro plant, costing about $400 million. This private utility estimates its taxes to be:

	Per year
Federal taxes	$9,000,000
Local taxes	9,500,000
State taxes	4,500,000

The tax subsidy would amount to $23 million a year on only one-quarter part of this project.

INFLATION LOSS

If and when repayments are made, what do we receive for today's loans to this project? In the past 50 years, from the year 1905 to 1955, the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from $1 to 32 cents. If this inflationary rate continues, the repayment over a 50-year average, will be worth less than one-third of the $1,658,000,000 invested.

NO INVESTMENT BY BENEFICIARIES

It is interesting to observe that—

First. The 6,700 farmers, who claim these benefits, invest nothing in this project.

Second. The municipalities, who want water facilities, invest nothing.

Third. The power companies who purchase power without investment in plants, invest nothing.

Fourth. The States of Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado invest nothing.

If these beneficiaries have no faith in their self-conceived project, how can they ask the people of the other 44 States to take all the risk without any of the benefits. This is truly a heads, I win and tails, you lose proposal.

WATER SUPPLY

The Federal financing of $72 million for municipal water systems is wholly unrelated to reclamation. It constitutes an unjustifiable preference in Federal financing for one segment of the country when hundreds of thousands of municipalities lack finances for their own expansion of water distribution needs. This would constitute a private, not a public PWA project, without any of the merits of the PWA.

ELECTRIC RATES

The fiscal irresponsibility of this project is illustrated by the proposed Curacanti and Juniper power projects.

The cost of electricity sold by private taxpaying steam plants in the area is 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The same power generated at Curacanti will cost 9.6 mills and the cost at Juniper will be 10 mills per kilowatt-hour. No one has yet tried to explain how you can profitably sell electricity at 7.3 mills when it costs 9.6 mills and 10 mills to produce.

NAVAHO PROJECT

The Navaho project is submitted by the Indian Bureau as a private relief project. The Reclamation Bureau is so dubious about it that it took great pains to disclaim responsibility for it.

Although it takes only $240 to relocate an Indian to an industrial job, this bill would bestow $192,000 upon each of the 1,100 Navaho families.

If this bill is passed, why should not we grant $192,000 to each of 120,000 other Indian families, so that there will be no discrimination?

This is the revival of the WPA as a private instead of a public WPA project, without any of the merits of the WPA.

NO APPROVAL BY ENGINEERS

It is generally conceded that the United States Army engineers are the top authority on engineering and fiscal feasibility for projects of this type.

On July 3, 1951, Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army engineers, severely criticized this project, and said:

> In conclusion, therefore, I am unable to concur in the recommendations in your report at this time with respect to approval of the overall plan and the immediate authorization of the initial phase proposed.

In its latest report in 1954 the United States engineers again criticized and refused to approve this project using the exact same language.

At no time, and I repeat, at no time, has the United States Army engineers, the Budget Bureau, the Reclamation Bureau, the Federal Power Commission, or the Agriculture Department, approved this complete project as contained in Senate 500.

If this House approves this project by passing this initiating bill, it must do so upon its sole responsibility as to economic, financial, and enginering feasibility.

FARM PRODUCTS WILL COMPETE WITH 48 STATES

The proponents sincerely and seriously claim that the farm expansion on 1,016,675 adidtional acres will not compete with other farmers. Nothing could be more fallacious.

I say 1,016,000 acres because those are the figures contained in the Senate Report 500 that is available at this desk. It is not 120,000 acres. It is 1,016,000 acres.

This country is one agricultural market. Our agricultural economy is so flexible that our farmers can shift their production, almost overnight, from cotton, to soybeans, to corn, to hogs, to poultry, to milk, or to 50 other farm products.

The sugar beets to be grown on these additional acres in Utah will compete with the cane sugar of Louisiana and with the sugar beets now grown in Utah and in a dozen other Midwest and Western States.

The excess corn, wheat, barley, and oats grown in Utah will compete with the same products produced in 40 other States.

The cattle, hogs, sheep, and milk produced in Utah, on these lands, will compete with and lower prices for the same products in 40 other States. Mr. Chairman, this bill would have the Federal Government invest $1,658,000,000 in a scheme which, primarily, proposes to irrigate lands owned by 6,700 farmers and 1,100 Navaho Indians. The investment averages more than $200,000 for each of these, 7,800 families.

This investment is subsidized and inevitably the products produced must also be subsidized. In their self-interest, these farmers will seek to repay as little as possible of the allocated costs assessed to them. Due to the Federal investment, they will seek greater and

greater subsidies for their produce from the Federal Government.

We are transforming these 7,800 families from farmers producing salable products into lobbyists whose prime motive is to exert political pressures for increasing governmental subsidies.

This grandiose plan destroys the capital investment of $1,658,000,000, it wastes precious water resources, it depletes the fertile soil bank lands, it depresses all farm market prices, and it further delays the balancing of supply with market demands for farm products. The taxation of farmers, to increase farm surpluses, is adding insult to injury.

This bill is a travesty upon good commonsense.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to be recommitted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the work of the gentleman who has just spoken has been outstanding in our committee. He has been very industrious. The bill before us today, however, is the House bill and not the Senate bill on which he has spent most of his time debating this afternoon. The Senate bill is not before this body. The House bill, a much more modest bill and, in my opinion, an economically feasible bill, is the one on which we are having this debate.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for people who are not only my constituents but constituents of every Member of this House, for they are wards of the Government and they and their property are and have been under control of the Federal Government for more than a century.

New Mexico and Arizona had hardly been under the rule of the American Government a few years, when the American soldiers in 1863 under Kit Carson rounded up all the Navaho people—men, women, and children—uprooted them from the banks of the San Juan and other streams, and marched them 200 miles away to Fort Sumner. There they were held captive in a concentration camp for 5 years. By 1868 they were dying so fast, that the military marched them back and turned them loose on a very restricted area of the poorest land ever. In the treaty those Indians were forced to sign, they promised never to leave the limited reservation assigned to them.

Except for an abortive effort to rehabilitate these Indians back in 1898, which was abandoned almost before it got started, nothing of any consequence was done for them, and they endured almost a whole century of suffering, neglect, and injustice at the hands of the people who confiscated their lands. In the thirties and forties many millions of dollars finally were expended in an effort to provide hospitals and schools, but that effort was so inadequate that in 1948 there were 14,000 Navaho children who had no schooling whatsoever.

In 1950 another effort was begun, and a bill authorized the expenditure of $88 million in an effort to rehabilitate these Indians. That program expires in 1960. Over $50 million has already been expended on that program. Yet Commissioner Emmons testified before the committee that it would be between a quarter and a half a century or more before this tribe could become self-sufficient, and then only if the problem is attacked from every possible angle. Commissioner Emmons said before the Senate committee:

> From every point of view, I believe it is far better to invest in Navaho economic rehabilitation than in Navaho relief, in permanent stability than in the present ever worsening instability and frustration. The Navaho project offers us the best and largest opportunity of striking out in that direction.

It is unnecessary to enumerate in detail the innumerable injustices committed by us against a great people through almost a century since they were rounded up in 1863. What I have said has been only because we have a right to feel indignant when opponents of this bill refer to the benefits contemplated by this legislation for the Navahos as a huge gift, and an inordinately expensive one at that.

They are wrong on both counts. It is not a gift, but the discharge of an obligation which the Nation owes to the Navaho people. In fact we owe it to ourselves as a nation to do this at the very least, and at any cost, in honor and good conscience.

Nor is it as expensive as their propaganda tries to make it appear. The final plans and reports on which the irrigation project will be considered by Congress at the proper time will show that this will not be any more expensive acre for acre than similar irrigation elsewhere.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] the day before yesterday repeated a statement which has caused a great deal of confusion. When I asked him to yield so that we could advise him, as he had asked, whether it was true or false, he declined to yield.

What has occurred here to create the confusion is that a photostatic copy of 2 or 3 questions and answers taken out of context was sent to every Member of Congress, designed to show that a 100-acre farm for each Navaho Indian family, would cost $192,000.

I do not have it. But you will remember it; it was entitled "PILLION Speechless."

I was speechless at the audacity, and the unfairness of whoever was responsible for that photostatic handout.

Those questions and answers were based on a quick, off the cuff, pencil calculation by a committee member, and in good faith, I am sure. But those who distributed it knew that the conclusions asserted in their handout were as false as all the rest of the unfair, unethical, and unwarranted propaganda to which we have been subjected.

The questions and answers circulated are from page 233 of the hearings. In the same testimony at page 239 the complete cost figures were placed in the record, and clearly showed the error of the quick calculation, at page 233.

Those figures show that the $211,845,000 upon which the pencil calculation of $200,000 per family was made at the hearing included $36 million for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir; it also included 29,000 acres which are to be irrigated by non-Indians; and it included nearly $11 million for the Kutz Canyon pumping plant for non-Indian irrigation. Unwittingly, in the pencil calculation this entire total amount was charged to 110,000 acres of the Indian project, and, of course, the result was a completely erroneous and excessive figure. There are other inaccuracies which I do not have the time to enumerate, but this will suffice to illustrate the falsity and fallacy of this propaganda.

And of course, the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, as distinguished from the Navaho's irrigation project, is to serve many purposes, including the irrigation of non-Indian lands, the San Juan-Chama Transmountain Diversion, and a large amount of industrial and municipal water to be used by non-Indians, and as well to take its part in the overall purpose of providing the total storage structure to control, regulate, and distribute the waters of the entire basin. The entire cost of the dam is to be repaid to the Government from the power revenues.

In that same handout they say that because it was so expensive the Navaho irrigation project had been dropped from the bill, intimating that the Navahos will get nothing from it, when the truth of the matter is, and they know it, that the Navaho irrigation project and the south San Juan project, and the San Juan-Chama diversion project, never have been in this legislation except on a provisional authorization basis. Only the storage dam at a cost of $36 million has been in from the start.

Then they turn around and say, quite to the contrary—they are so zealous they meet themselves coming and going—that the construction of the Navaho Dam and Reservoir commits us firmly to providing the Navaho Indians with an irrigation project. To that I say amen, it does do that. This bill does authorize the Navaho Dam, which among other things will store water for an Indian irrigation project, and when this is done we are firmly committed to provide the irrigation project through which the waters of the dam so impounded may be used.

Legally and morally the Navaho Indians are entitled to a fair share of the waters of the San Juan River, their river, and the only one they have. We all know that if in the overall storage control and distribution of the upper Colorado Basin waters, no provision is made for storage of the Indian waters, so they may hold them and use them when and where it is feasible, we have taken their water away just as effectively as if we included in this bill a provision saying:

> The waters of the Navaho Indians in the San Juan River are hereby appropriated for the mainstream of the Colorado River, and shall be permitted to flow unimpeded down the Colorado River to southern California and Mexico, for the use and benefit of those who may have the influence, the finances,

and the capacity to put them to beneficial use.

I have said before, and I say now, that no Congress with any conscience is going to take these waters away from the Indians, and the only way to prevent their being taken away from the Indians is to provide the necessary storage to hold them.

Navaho families are by Government regulation allowed to pasture only 250 head of sheep per family, which barely gives them a subsistence living, if it does that. It was testified that transfer of some of those families into a farming economy, will permit an increase in the number of sheep to each family, and perhaps a better than a bare subsistence living which is now their lot.

The building of the dam itself and other irrigation works, and their operation, will provide employment for thousands of Navaho people. It was testified that the placing of 1,110 families on approximately 110,000 acres of irrigated land, would create work and provide livelihood not only for those families but for a total of 18,000 Navaho people. Many people believe that the 100-acre allotments can be cut in half, and still provide a good livelihood for twice the number of families at present contemplated.

For example the testimony is that there are now 7,669 acres farmed by 900 Navaho farm families, with about a $300,000 income from produce. That is the record. If they can do that on an average of 8½ acres, they can do so 5 times better on 40 or 50.

Of course the Navahos do not go in and will not go in for farming on a commercial scale. The farms will provide a home and land enough to raise what they need to eat and to feed their own stock, with very little to sell and that probably only for trade among their own people.

The Navaho Reservation with a population of 70,000 Navahos, consists of 24,000 square miles of territory. In total area it approximates the combined States of Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. It is twice the combined area of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands. It is rich in natural undeveloped resources. There are small areas of timber. There are large deposits of minerals such as coal and uranium. In fact it was a Navaho Indian who discovered the largest deposit of uranium yet known. The helium in the reservation has been preempted by the Government which holds a monopoly on it. These and other resources can be developed, and industry created when and if water is impounded and stored for their use within the limits of their share, and the share of New Mexico waters under the compact, to which the Navaho waters have been charged.

Notwithstanding all these lands and these resources the Navaho Indians therein will continue to live under standards which are a discredit to this Government of ours, and notwithstanding the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in the years to come, unless the water necessary to develop their resources is impounded and put to beneficial use, and unless we continue a rehabilitation program that will make them self-sufficient and self-sustaining. Use of their waters to which they are justly entitled will be one big long step forward. I repeat that no Congress is going to take these waters away from the Indians and that unless these waters are impounded they will as effectively lose them as if they were taken away from them. I have confidence therefore that the Congress will meet these obligations irrespective of the cost involved.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I come from a portion of California that does not necessarily associate me with either southern California or northern California, since it happens that my home and my district are in almost the geographical center of that great State.

During some of the discussions that have gone on here, there has been some question in my mind as to whether or not the State of California or certain other Western States were on trial here with reference to some of the things they may have done in the past or some of their past performances with reference to the water of the Colorado River.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that considered this bill over a period of many, many weeks, I felt that we had two basic principles on which to make our determination as to whether or not we would support or oppose the legislation we have before us today. Those two basic principles, as I understood them, were with reference to the economic feasibility of this project, and whether or not the people of the upper basin States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—had any rights to the water of the Colorado River.

The thing that I considered with reference to this particular principle was the statement we find throughout the legislation we have before us here today, and that is, those rights which are found in section 9 of the bill, wherein the statement is made:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision—

Then we have a long list of contracts and of agreements between the State of California and the upper basin States.

I am here as a Representative from California to say that I do not desire to give away one drop of California's water, but I do believe that the upper basin States have certain rights under these compacts and that California is fully protected by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] made the statement that he did. Much has been said here in the past 2 days with regard to the water rights problem on the Colorado River. I suspect that there are not going to be any votes changed one way or the other on that particular point. But, for the benefit of my friends from southern California who have raised the question as to southern California's water rights, with particular reference to one engineering report, the Hill report, I would like to refer them to an item I put in the RECORD of yesterday, dealing with the problem. To emphasize again what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has said, that is, that section 14 of this bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall manage these water projects in accord with the basic pact on the river, the law of the river. If he does not do so, any State can go to the Supreme Court, and the consent of the Congress to join the Federal Government in that suit is already given. Any State that does not like the administration of these projects and says that the law of the river is not being complied with can simply step into the Supreme Court and get that matter adjudicated.

Some reference has been made here in this debate to the engineering on this project. For my own part, I am perfectly willing to leave that to the engineers. I do not believe that the men who built Hoover and who built Parker Dam and who built Davis Dam and who built Grand Coulee and who built Shasta Dam and who built many, many others of the great water and power projects in this country are going to build a dam that will float down the Colorado River.

Some reference too has been made to the question of public power. I want to say to you that this bill contains the standard provisions for transmission lines. It contains authorization for a basic transmission loop, and it contains standard provisions for preferences to municipalities, irrigation districts, and other public agencies.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. It contains, does it not, an authorization of approximately $145,332,000 to take care of what the gentleman just mentioned?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. Now we have to say because of the vast area involved, it is a difficult matter to get to these load centers, and for that reason the power has to be handled on just a little bit different basis. But as one who has consistently supported public power here in this Congress, I say that this bill does everything that we can do with regard to the maintenance of the public power system.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a very able member of our committee, spent his time here discussing the Senate bill. I know some of you may say, "Oh, well, we pass half a loaf here, and get a whole loaf sent back to us from the Senate side." I want to say to you, as I said to the Committee on Rules, with respect to Echo Park: As far as I am concerned, we will either leave Echo Park out or we will kill this legislation.

If my colleagues on the conference will stay with me, we will not budge 1 inch on this legislation. We think this is a

good bill. We think it is completely adequate and we think it is a start for at least two decades for this great area, and it gets them on their way. If I have my way, as one of the conferees, I want to give the assurance that we intend to stand on the House bill.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, this project will not contribute to the surpluses of corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, wheat and tobacco, because only two of those, wheat and corn, are grown in any volume.

History shows that putting land under irrigation moves that land out of the production of wheat and corn.

Finally, the amount of new land added under irrigation, which is one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland, is not a significant factor, and never can be, in relation to the farm surpluses of this country.

I repeat, the total new land brought under irrigation is only one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of the national cropland.

On the economics, the evidence is clear, and supported by the experts in the Interior Department and the Bureau of the Budget, that this project pays back 99 percent of the capital investment, with interest on the investment and power and municipal water.

The actual tax contribution from general taxes will be less than $14 million a year and all of that will bear interest, because the contribution from the reclamation fund more than covers the amount used for irrigation.

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

All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork, San Juan Chama, Navaho: *Provided*, That (a) no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project of the Navaho participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That with reference to the San Juan Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of line 5 down to and including the word "and" in line 9.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, just a brief explanation of the committee amendment. It strikes out language in the bill which some Members, especially our colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] thought was too broad in the preamble reciting the authority under which this project is to be authorized. Therefore the language was stricken out and the language substituted which narrowed the base of the recitation of the constitutional provisions under which projects of this character are authorized.

I say that merely by way of explanation. It is a technical amendment as are those which are offered down to the one that strikes out Echo Park—and that is one about which we have spoken in the debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the ranking minority member of the committee which has charge of this bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], read a statement, a press release, which advised us that the President wanted this bill passed. That raises in my mind a question of just how far the President went, just what he does want; and that doubt grows out of the fact that on another occasion it was charged that an administrative action by the Department of the Interior was influenced by the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, because of that false charge I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and have offered a resolution which was sent to the Clerk's desk.

This question raised by the resolution affects the dignity and the integrity of the proceedings of the House.

In September of 1955, a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, joined in the investigation and subsequent hearings to "develop further facts and current information relative to problems of access to Government timber, including access roads; inadequate and outdated inventory data on Federal timber resources; increases in the allowable cut; revised timber sales practices to provide sales of a size and length that meet the needs of small and large operators alike; increased salvage sales of diseased and burned timber; and a reexamination of the effect of marketing area and other restrictions on Government timber sales."

Subsequent thereto, joint hearings were held by said subcommittees in Washington and other parts of the country. On November 25, 1955, at Portland, Oreg., a statement by Senator W. KERR SCOTT, chairman, Joint Committee on Federal Timber, was issued, concurred in by Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and made a part of the record.

That statement in part reads as follows:

The subcommittee will come to order.

We will now go into a matter that is not specifically a "timber sales policy problem."

Rather, it involves the question, or questions, of how certain agencies are following the intent of the Congress, the letter and spirit of the laws of the land and the democratic processes that are demanded by the Constitution of the United States in respect to our forests and mineral resources.

The transcript of the hearing held by this Joint Committee in Roseburg, Oreg., on November 17, 1955, discloses that certain segments of the Department of Interior are in a hassle with an aged, disabled veteran over his rights under the mining laws of the United States Government.

There appears to be a concerted effort to hustle him off his three mining claims based on the allegation that the claims are not mineral in character.

In sharp contrast to this case, I am mindful of a considerable amount of talk in the past 18 months concerning what is known as the Al Sarena mining claims located in Jackson County, Oreg.

There are many Government records involving the Al Serena mining claims and their background and their value, or lack of value, as mineral lands that have been cloaked in obscurity and covered with the dust of more than 15 years.

The Congress needs to know, and the people of America are entitled to know, what the facts are in connection with this

case which was finally decided at the highest level of the Department of Interior.

This Senate subcommittee, and this House Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, and the Congress, would be derelict in its duty if it did not seek to determine the truth or falsity of the charges that have been made that, as a result of the high level interference in the Department of Interior, weasel-word legal opinions and questionable mineral sampling and assaying practices have been substituted for the dedicated judgment and experience of men trained in the art of determining which lands are, or are not, eligible for patent under the mineral laws of the land.

It is either true, or untrue, that the lands of the 15 Al Sarena disputed claims are mineral in character of just a site for a timber mining operation. It is the purpose of this inquiry to seek the answer to this question, and the one of just why and how the unprecedented step was taken of bypassing the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to accomplish what was accomplished.

Because of the serious nature of this inquiry, going, as it does, into the very fountain spring of the question of government by laws or government by influence and special privilege, all witnesses will be sworn before testifying.

It will be noted that the foregoing statements raise the question as to whether the patents therein referred to and granted on February 11, 1954, were granted because claimants were entitled to the patents, or whether the granting of the patents by the Secretary of the Interior came about because, among other things, they were the "result of high level interference in the Department of the Interior."

Frequently, throughout the hearings, it was charged that the granting of the patents was due not only to fraud, but because of influence and pressure put upon the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates by Government officials and officeholders at a "high" administrative level.

In January 1956, hearing were held in Washington, D. C., and, on January 10, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article in which it was stated that "a full-dress investigation of one of the biggest timber giveaways in recent years, namely, the sale of Rogue River National Forest timber to political friends of Congressman"—of the minority party and naming him—"would be held."

This story also referred by name to another Congressman, of the majority party.

Both Congressmen by innuendo were charged with exerting influence and putting pressure upon the Department of the Interior, and further charged that because of this pressure, the patents referred to were granted.

The January 16, 1956, edition of the same publication further charged that the Department of the Interior had gone to unusual lengths to coach and shield witnesses who had been called to testify before the committee.

The January 27, 1956, issue of this publication, among other things, charged that the Secretary of the Interior had sold timber worth more than $200,000 for around $2,270.

This article further charged that the Secretary of the Interior—naming him—had been influenced to expedite the granting of the patents because of a note direct from the President of the United States. The article stated:

Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

Across the letter in his own handwriting President Eisenhower had scribbled "Dear Doug." Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he should do about granting the Rogue River request.

On February 3, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article which, among other things, stated that a member of the committee, naming him, "went to Arthur Pearlman, counsel of that committee"—meaning the subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations—"and demanded":

"I want you to subpena Drew Pearson."

"What for?" asked Pearlman.

"Make him come up here and answer before the House of Representatives as to where he got that information regarding Al Sarena. Make him produce that 'Dear Doug' letter which he says Eisenhower wrote to Secretary McKay. I want a subpena issued for Pearson at once."

"Then," replied Pearlman, "we would also have to subpena Secretary McKay."

"Oh, no, no, no," replied Congressman HOFFMAN, promptly dropping the matter.

NOTE.—HOFFMAN had first demanded that the Senate Interior Committee subpena this writer.

On February 12, 1956, the same paper carried a story in which the writer commented as follows:

The charge was made in connection with a column on the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon in which I reported that when a letter arrived at the White House regarding the Al Serena mining claim in Rogue River Forest, Ike had scribbled a note across the top of the letter to "Dear Doug"—meaning Secretary of the Interior Doug McKay—and suggested that he see what he could do about the matter.

The origin of this story was as follows:

Having heard reports that such a letter was found in the files of the Interior Department during the Senate probe of the Rogue River National Forest sale, I sent my assistant to see Robert Redwine, counsel of a Senate Interior subcommittee.

Redwine said he had such a letter but that he did not intend to let me see it. He indicated, among other things, that he planned to make use of it later in the year, when it would be more effective in the presidential campaign.

I then went to a Senator who is a member of the Interior Committee and suggested that any probe of the Al Serena-Rogue River National Forest giveaway should present all the facts in an orderly manner and should not withhold any for political purposes later. He agreed and contacted Redwine.

Redwine said that he did have a letter which had been forwarded to McKay by the White House with a note addressed to "Dear Doug" scribbled across it in Ike's own handwriting, but he demurred about letting me see it and regarding the use of it.

I then went to the administrator of the Senate Interior Committee. Perhaps I was overdoing the eager beaver cub-reporter act, but having been doing that act for a good many years in Washington, it's hard to get out of the habit; and having had the first scoop on the Rogue River Forest sale over a year ago, I was juvenile enough to want to continue my batting average.

Anyway Redwine was called in and asked about the letter.

"I know why you want that letter," he bristled. "You want to show it to that guy Drew Pearson. I'm not going to let him have it."

After some further pro-ing and con-ing, continuing over several days, I finally published the report that such a "Dear Doug" letter was in the files of the Senate Interior Committee. I did not quote the text of what Ike allegedly said to "Dear Doug" since I had not seen and therefore did not know the exact text.

Following publication, the Capitol began to vibrate as if the British Navy once again was rolling barrels of tar into the Senate Chamber to set fire to the place.

Every Republican on the full Interior Committee immediately turned up at a subcommittee hearing, plus crochety Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan, a member of the joint subcommittee, who demanded that I be subpenaed. CLARE has subpenaed me before so I was not exactly surprised by his new gyrations. Other Senators, led by GOLDWATER of Arizona, called in Redwine and wanted to know about the letter. Redwine at first stated there was such a letter.

When asked to produce it, he came back with a letter from the Interior Department acknowledging one from the White House. Obviously, it was not the "Dear Doug" letter. In brief, he did not produce. I was out on a limb and still am.

Later, he told other Senate committee staff members that he had seen such a letter and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it, but that he had searched high and low and could not find it now. He also stated that he had found his files rifled.

A check at the Sergeant at Arms office revealed the fact that Redwine had complained two weeks earlier about his files being tampered with and had asked for specially locked filing cabinets.

It was at this point that Jim Hagerty issued his White House blast.

Since I cannot produce the letter, I am now prepared to accept Hagerty's statement as being correct.

At a meeting of the committee held on January 26, 1956, the following occurred:

[Transcript of hearings, Washington, D. C., Thursday, January 26, 1956, pp 1178–1182]

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Secretary—

Under Secretary Clarence Davis was the witness—

In this morning's paper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, under the byline of Drew Pearson, appeared this statement, and I will read it to you:

"Buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter, which was picked up when the Senate subpenaed the records of Secretary McKay.

"It's a letter from a friend of President Eisenhower's addressed to him, asking that the Al Sarena section of the Rogue River National Forest be released to the McDonald family.

"Across the letter in his own handwriting, President Eisenhower had scribbled 'Dear Doug.' Then followed a personal request from Ike to Doug to see what he could do about granting the Rogue River request."

That is the end of the quote, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. DAVIS. I have none, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, inasmuch as this reporter says, and I quote, "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files is an interesting letter," does the counsel have this letter?

Mr. COBURN. I do not have it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Does Mr. Redwine have this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I do not.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do any of the counsel have this letter?

Mr. LENIGAN. Never have seen it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Have you ever seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I haven't any comments on that, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think it is very important. The honesty of the President of the United States has been impugned by this person in writing his column this morning and I think it is necessary that we get this cleared up when he speaks with evidently some authority saying "buried in the Senate Interior Committee files." Have you seen this letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I have not seen the letter that is referred to there; no, sir.

The letter referred to was alleged to be a letter written before the granting of the patents.

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Can you get that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. I think so.

Senator GOLDWATER. Where is it?

Mr. REDWINE. It is downstairs.

Senator GOLDWATER. In the files?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that we have that letter in these hearings.

Mr. Redwine of the staff then left the committee hearing room to get the letter.

Senator GOLDWATER. I do not want to delay the proceedings and when Mr. Redwine comes back with this letter, may I have permission to proceed a minute or two after seeing it? Why do you not go ahead with whatever questioning counsel might have?

Mr. Redwine being absent for the letter, the hearings then continued on another matter.

Page 1194:

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Redwine is back. I wonder if we might see the letter that he brought with him.

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chairman, Senator GOLDWATER asked me awhile ago about a letter with respect to what was in the column this morning. I said that I had not seen that letter. That is correct, I believe, Senator.

You asked me then if I had seen any letter regarding the President of the United States in respect to the Al Sarena case. I said that I had.

Note how Mr. Redwine evaded making a clear, direct answer. He had previously been asked, and I quote:

Senator GOLDWATER. Had you ever seen a letter that the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior on in this particular case?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

And Mr. Redwine then left the committee hearing room to get the letter which he said was downstairs in the files.

Senator GOLDWATER then continued:

Senator GOLDWATER. I think I included in my question, although I might not have, a letter that contained a personal note to Mr. McKay. Might we see that letter?

Mr. REDWINE. This letter, Senator, that I have here is addressed—I will hand it to you in just a minute—to a Mr. Powell. It is signed by Secretary McKay. The first paragraph reads:

"Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River National Forest mining claim allowance, has been referred to me for reply."

Mr. McKay then replied to it.

This letter of reply by Mr. McKay to Mr. Powell is dated January 5, 1955, after this [the Al Sarena] decision was over [made on February 11, 1954].

Senator GOLDWATER. Who is Mr. Powell?

Mr. REDWINE. I don't know, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Is there scribbled on that in the President's handwriting anything that says "Dear Doug"?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Representative JONAS. Do you know whether there is in the committee files any such letter as that?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know.

Representative JONAS. Can you tell us whether you or any staff member took out of the Department of the Interior file any such letter as was referred to by Mr. Pearson in his column?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know, sir.

Representative JONAS. The inference is certainly clearly to be drawn from the column in the paper that there exists at present in the files of this committee such a letter which committee staff members obtained when they went through the file in the Department of the Interior, but you have no knowledge of any such letter or any such communication?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. JONAS, I might comment that this letter from the contents of it seems to be in opposition to the granting of these patents. The answer to Mr. Powell would lead me to believe that Mr. Powell wrote criticizing the President.

Mr. REDWINE. I didn't evaluate the letter at all, Senator.

Senator KUCHEL. It is irrelevant to your question.

Senator GOLDWATER. It is irrelevant to my question. It is astounding to me that a member of the press of this country would constantly refer to those lies and, if there are leaks in the committee staff, I think Mr. Chairman, we should investigate it.

How would Drew Pearson know of the existence of any letter unless somebody in this committee staff were telling him these things and how can he justify his statement that was contained in his column this morning that goes to some 600 newspapers in this country, if I am not incorrectly informed, that the President of the United States had personally interceded in this case?

I made a speech on the floor the other day on this subject in which I agreed with Senator NEUBERGER on the need for freedom of the press. This man is destroying the freedom of the press.

That is all I have to comment.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this morning's statement by Mr. Pearson seems to be to the effect that the President gave support, by a notation on a letter, to the charge that the Secretary of the Interior had participated in a steal of timber, it seems to me that Mr. Pearson should be brought before the committee and we should understand or be given an opportunity to learn where he gets his information.

Page 1198:

In this situation to which the Senator has called this morning—there it is right before us and there are those charges—should we not try to learn whether or not the President did as charged by Mr. Pearson; endorse this steal? I ask that Mr. Pearson be called, put under oath, and that the Senator or the members of the committee have an opportunity to examine him as to where he got his information.

Pages 1200–1203:

Senator GOLDWATER. I can agree with much the Senator from Oregon says, but in a column that is read by millions of American people is a statement that says that the President of the United States intervened, I feel sure that had such a letter existed it would have long ago been put in these records. I think that I am perfectly within my rights in asking whether or not such a letter existed and if my comments on what I feel to be the responsibility of all reporters and the press to report accurately do not coincide with the thoughts of the Senator from Oregon, I am sorry.

I happen to be a layman, I am not a newspaperman; but I am like Will Rogers, all I know is what I read in the newspapers, and I want to feel when I read it in the papers that it is correct. I am glad we had this opportunity to clear it up because we will further clear it up on the floor of the Senate.

Representative HOFFMAN. I make a motion that Mr. Pearson be called, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the chairman rule that he be called by the committee as a witness. I want to know who sanctioned and approved his course in charging the President of the United States of participating or giving support to a steal, alleged to be a steal, by the Secretary of the Interior.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am just going to say that I am not going to put the motion.

Representative HOFFMAN. You are not the chairman.

Senator NEUBERGER. Senator SOTT appointed me as acting chairman when he left and on his return asked if I would continue to preside.

Representative HOFFMAN. Has the salary been turned over, together with the gavel? That may be irrelevant.

Senator SCOTT. He gets the same.

Representative HOFFMAN. You won't put the motion?

Senator NEUBERGER. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. You haven't.

Representative HOFFMAN. I don't care if you want to cover up for him.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am not covering up for him. I just want to say that Congressman CHUDOFF isn't here. Furthermore, I want to say this for the record: I truly believe in freedom of the press in our society. I believe if any newspaper, or journalist, or radio commentator makes a misstatement that it is within the province of those about whom the mistatement was made to correct it in a public forum.

When I ran for the Senate, over 80 percent of the newspapers in my State opposed me very vigorously, extremely vigorously at times, I might add. That was their right. Naturally, I think they were mistaken, but that was their right, and I have never suggested or hinted that because of the things they said about me, many of which were unkind, and a good many of which were grossly untrue, they ought to be hailed before any committee. I think so far as I am concerned, we have already had too much hailing of members of the press before committees, and you don't happen to like a certain newspaperman, so you want to hail him up.

It may be that those of us on the other side don't like another newspaperman of different political persuasion and we might be tempted, unwisely, I think, into calling him up and subpenaeing him. As a former journalist and as a person who is devoted to freedom of the press, I think that any suggestion that we turn this investigation and study of natural resources into an inquisition of newspapermen or journalists or commentators is out of order.

Representative HOFFMAN. All right, Mr. Chairman. I am not complaining about the printing of anything especially, but this committee is supposed to be investigating

this particular case where the charge is that this land—and this article this morning charged it—was given away here, although I notice he came down from $600,000 in value of the timber to $200,000, which is quite a shrinkage within a week, but where the charge is, and the charge has been in the previous articles all the way through, that the Secetary of the Interior participated in a timber steal—that is the way it has been characterized time and time again—if the committee is interested, and it has called many witnesses in trying to determine whether or not it was a timber steal, why logically shouldn't we call a man who professes to have evidence that it was and that they had gone to the highest level of authority to put it over?

If you want the facts, Pearson has the facts, allegedly, so why not call him?

Pages 1204–1208:

Senator GOLDWATER. * * * I don't like to see a man in this position say that in the files of this committee there is a letter from the President of the United States and I don't think the Senator from Oregon feels very happy about it, either.

Senator NEUBERGER. I think we ought to go on ahead and I don't think we ought to go off in any pursuit of the press.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, just once more, if I may. I am not criticizing the press. I have nothing against freedom of the press or freedom of speech. I use it, so certainly I couldn't be against it. But in this article the charge is that the President himself, by the note on a letter, influenced the action of the Secretary of the Interior.

Are you not interested? The whole hearing, if I understand correctly, on this Al Sarena, ever since the 25th day of November, has been to attempt to learn why the Secretary granted these patents. We have had some testimony of both sides on that now. I notice counsel shakes his head. We have. Here is a man who professes to know that the President himself asked McKay to do it. Do you want to know whether the higher level did or didn't, or do you want to forget it?

Senator GOLDWATER. Let me pursue one other thought on this. I mentioned this earlier. Ever since I have come to Congress I have been very concerned with the leaks that go on in this building. I don't believe that any reporter would just sit down at a typewriter and dream something like this up. Possibly, Mr. HOFFMAN, we ought to suggest that we investigate our own staff to see who is leaking these things, to see who called Mr. Pearson and said, "Look, we have a letter down here that the President of the United States scribbled a note on."

Maybe we are talking, as the Senator from Oregon suggests, about the wrong side of this thing. Maybe we ought to look into our own staff and find out who is giving this information out that was completely erroneous.

Representative HOFFMAN. That was not my point. I don't care what the staff does. My point was that the chairman of the committee, Senator SCOTT, the distinguished chairman here from North Carolina, in a statement put out, said that the higher level overruled these gentlemen in the Department. We got into the highest level. We have gotten up to the top. We have gotten up to the President of the United States, and here is a newspaperman, who undoubtedly has some knowledge of what he is talking about, who says that the President in his own handwriting wrote across this letter telling the Secretary of the Interior to do that. Aren't we as a matter of fact, as a matter of proof, interested in that?

Senator GOLDWATER. We should at the same time be interested in who is putting this information out. This isn't the first instance.

Representative HOFFMAN. That is all right, but here is an issue that is squarely before this committee: Who caused tnis patent to be granted? Here is a man who says in this release published all over the country that he knows that a certain gentleman in the White House advised the Secretary to do it. Do you want to know who determined this thing for the Secretary, or don't you? There is a witness. There is a witness if you want him. Of course, you have the authority. You have the gavel over there.

Senator NEUBERGER. We have the testimony this morning that the Secretary absolutely knew nothing about it and had nothing to do with it; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me, but you have Mr. Pearson, who says that he knows that the other fellow—

Senator NEUBERGER. You people are so accustomed to having every single thing that appears in the press pleasing to you that what you want to do is call up anybody who prints something that you don't like. Will you let me finish?

Representative HOFFMAN. I am awfully sorry.

Senator NEUBERGER. You put a vast mass of material in the record from newspapers defending what was done. Should we ask the authors of those articles up?

Representative HOFFMAN. If you want to; I don't care.

Senator NEUBERGER. I don't believe we should enter into an inquisition or study of the press, period, whether they write something that you like or whether they write something that somebody else likes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the grace of a minute or two. This statement was prepared before I ever saw the Pearson column. It is the truth. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that when in a column of that kind there can appear scurrilous attacks upon the President of the United States, and especially a man of the high character of President Ensenhower, and it can go unchallenged that he interferred by some method or other with this thing we are talking about, we have arrived at a serious point in these United States.

Now, I said here that Secretary McKay didn't even know about this thing except very extremely casually. I know nothing about any letter from the President of the United States. So far as I know, no such letter ever was written and I have no recollection of it, no communications with the President, not anything of the kind.

This is my decision. I will stand on it as having been my best judgment at the time. It was not interferred with by anyone except as I have told you by the letters here of Congressmen of both political parties pleading about it and that sort of thing, no other inference of any kind that I know of. I want to say that I do resent, sir, and I resent keenly, the implication that I was subjected to any pressure from the President of the United States or anyone else in connection with the opinion which was rendered in this case.

I can hardly conceive that a committee would not make an effort to inquire about a statement that their own staff had leaked a letter impugning the integrity of the President of the United States and then by-pass it on the ground of freedom of the press.

Thank you, sir.

Pages 1209–1219:

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Chairman, may I break in for just a moment. Let's see if we can take this down a little bit. Mr. Redwine, do you have charge of the files which were subpenaed from the Department of the Interior concerning this Al Sarena matter?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, my answer on that will have to be "yes and no." At certain times I have had; other times I have not.

Senator KUCHEL. Where are they located now?

Mr. REDWINE. Some of them in 224 and some in 2–A.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you gone over personally the files which were subpenaed from the Department?

Mr. REDWINE. Senator, there was actually no files subpenaed from the Department. I did not go over them when they first came to the committee. I will have to ask Mr. Coburn if I am right on this.

Mr. COBURN. That is right.

Senator KUCHEL. Let me ask Mr. Redwine now and then I will ask you, Mr. Coburn. Mr. Redwine, is it your answer that you have not gone over the files on the Al Sarena case which you obtained from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir; I have gone over them.

Senator KUCHEL. You have gone over all of them?

Mr. REDWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator KUCHEL. Have you found—I guess this will be the second time you have been asked this question—any letter which indicates any message of any kind or character from the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. REDWINE. No, sir. I have answered that before.

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Coburn, let me ask you, have you gone over the records of this case as they have come to you from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. In a rather cursory way. If you let me make a statement, I will explain it.

Senator KUCHEL. All right.

Mr. COBURN. At the request of the Chairman of the Committee made in writing to the Secretary of the Interior, these files were sent up to the committee via special messenger, I believe—I believe a lawyer from the Solicitor's department—and made available to the staff of the committee. At that time, Mr. Chambers, Ed Chambers, was on the staff and he and I looked them over cursorily and subsequently I turned them over to him. This is in the main committee office.

Senator KUCHEL. Is Mr. Chambers still a member of our staff?

Mr. COBURN. I don't know. Yes; he is.

Senator KUCHEL. Were the files delivered by a messenger from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. COBURN. That is correct, and he remained in the room all the time. He stayed with the files.

Senator KUCHEL. Then when he left did we retain the files?

Mr. COBURN. We retained certain photostatic copies, things that we wanted.

Senator KUCHEL. Did you see at any time any letter which indicated any kind of interest by the President with respect to this matter?

Mr. COBURN. The only one that I recall was the one that Mr. Redwine introduced.

Senator KUCHEL. You referred, Mr. Coburn, to this photostatic copy of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to a man named Powell?

Mr. COBURN. I haven't seen it for a long time. I assume that is it.

Senator KUCHEL. This is the only one?

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

Senator KUCHEL. I want this letter to be placed in the record rather than try to interpret it. I think it might well be read, since it is the statement of our two counsels here that this constitutes the only time that the President's name is mentioned. This is from the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 5, 1955, and it reads as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Your letter to President Eisenhower relating to the Rogue River

National Forest mining claim allowance has been referred to me for reply.

"I share your concern for the preservation of the scenic grandeurs of the national parks and forests.

"The enclosed photostat from a newspaper which investigated this case, and which supported Adlai Stevenson, should clarify this matter for you.

"The decision granting this allowance to the Al Serena Mining Co. was entirely within the laws, which have been unchanged since 1876. The Secretary of the Interior is permitted no discretionary action under these laws.

"The 1876 statute provides that when minerals are discovered in paying quantities on mining claims the miner is entitled to a patent on the land, including the surface rights; and that once such minerals have been discovered the Secretary has no discretion in the matter.

"Before the Al Serena case was decided upon the legal staff of the Department made a painstaking and honest appraisal of all the facts. The decision was fully publicized several months ago through the press associations and in the major newspaper in the Pacific Northwest.

"In this Department's administration of the laws we are determined to comply with the law.

"This Department must adhere to the laws as they are written. If the laws need modernization, and in this case there appears to be that necessity, the legislative branch has the responsibility to revise them.

"I am glad to have had this opportunity to discuss this matter with you, and trust that I have reassured you that I am fully aware of my responsibility to all the citizens of this Nation.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

I ask that that be made a part of the record.

Senator KUCHEL. I think it is fair to say for the two attorneys of law who are members of this staff and who have had the primary custody of the data which has come from the Department of the Interior, that the statement in this morning's newspaper is incorrect.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to pursue this one a little bit further. I have before me a copy of an excerpt of Mr. Pearson's broadcast of January 21, 1956, in the course of which he spiels out the name of the Oregon Democrat who wrote the letter. There must be a little bit more to this than we know. I can't imagine that any man on the air would care to quote—"the amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

This is an interesting excerpt. I think it should be made a part of the record. I will be glad to read it. I quote:

"Capitol Hill, exclusive. The Senate Interior Committee has been nursing one of the hottest letters in Washington. They're trying to figure out what to do with it. It pertains to the famous sale of part of the Rogue River National Forest to the McDonald family, of Mobile, Ala., and why Secretary McKay went out of his way to make this amazing sale when other Secretaries of the Interior had consistently refused. The letter is from an Oregon insurance man to Eisenhower, asking that the Rogue River National Forest be sold to the McDonalds.

"Across the top of this letter Eisenhower wrote in his own handwriting: 'Dear Doug, please see what you can do about this.' Dear Doug, of course, referred to his Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay. The Senators now figure they have the answer as to why McKay acted. The amazing thing is that this letter was written by an Oregon Democrat, Lou Wallace."

I think we ought to see if there is such a letter some place. It would have a terrific bearing on this case.

Senator NEUBERGER. You mean a letter from a Democrat?

Senator GOLDWATER. No; no; the letter from the President saying "Dear Doug" or letters to that effect.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee?

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the staff director, I want to state that as far as the letter in question is concerned, I have never seen any such letter. I want to further state that all the files, all the letters, all the correspondence, in connection with the Al Sarena case have been in the possession of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and none of the correspondence or none of the files has ever been in the possession of the chairman or the rest of the staff of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Lou Wallace be asked if he did write such a letter. As I say, this could have a tremendous bearing on this case.

Representative HOFFMAN. I had a couple of questions I wanted to ask Mr. Redwine, Mr. Chairman, if I may. They are very brief.

Senator NEUBERGER. We are going to adjourn at 4:30 today.

Representative HOFFMAN. Mr. Redwine, who other than yourself and Mr. Coburn, and you said Mr. O'Brien——

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chambers.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who other than the three had access to these files?

Mr. REDWINE. So far as when they are in my office, only the two secretaries.

Representative HOFFMAN. Who are the secretaries?

Mr. REDWINE. Miss Hoban and Miss O'Connor.

Representative HOFFMAN. And no one else?

Mr. REDWINE. That is right.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether they have any business relations with Mr. Pearson?

Mr. REDWINE. Not so far as I know. I have never seen any indication of it.

Representative HOFFMAN. What do you say, Mr. Coburn?

Mr. COBURN. Do you want me to answer your specific question?

Representative HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. My office is wide open. It isn't even locked. It is just part of a room, except for a locked file drawer where I kept the Al Sarena files when I had them. I had a key to it. Mr. Mapes had a key to it. Mr. Mapes is a staff member. I don't think Mr. Chambers had a key to it, and I believe my secretary had a key to it.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you know whether any of these people, to ask the same question I put to Mr. Redwine, that you have known, or have you inquired to ascertain whether they gave any such information to Mr. Pearson?

Mr. COBURN. I have no reason to believe that they would give any information.

Representative HOFFMAN. I assume they won't, but he gets so much that is exclusive.

Mr. COBURN. May I make a statement on that point? We were never under any inhibition from the Department to keep these files secret. As a matter of fact, newspapermen have gone down to the Department and looked through the whole file.

Representative HOFFMAN. Do you mean that the newspapermen have gone through your office or that of Mr. Redwine, and gone to these files and gone through them?

Mr. COBURN. I say in the Department of the Interior.

Representative HOFFMAN. I understand the Department of the Interior gives them everything.

Mr. COBURN. The same file as there was in my office. It is the same file.

Representative HOFFMAN. But you gentlemen do not know anything about it, either one of you?

Mr. REDWINE. No.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing quotations show that the integrity of the committee and of the House was challenged by the newspaper and by committee counsel.

There were but two questions involved in the granting of the mining patents.

The first was whether there was mineralization on the land sufficient to justify the granting of the patents.

The other was whether the decision had been brought about by influence and pressure exerted at high levels.

Communications addressed to the Department of the Interior by two Members of the House, by one Member of the other body, were directly challenged.

This challenge reflects not only upon the Members named, but upon the integrity of the House and of the Congress as a whole.

The statement published not only in the Washington paper, but in many papers throughout the country challenges the integrity of the President of the United States, of the Secretary of the Interior, and goes directly to the solution of one of the principal issues which was before the committee, that is, whether the decision was the result of influence and pressure exerted at a high level.

Upon this issue, there was no direct testimony until the publication of the article above referred to and the statement of the committee counsel.

Inasmuch as the integrity of the House, of its committee, is directly challenged, the current resolution is offered. It reads:

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a committee of three to determine whether Robert Redwine, a member of the staff of the joint committee of the Senate and House which held hearings in Washington and elsewhere, has evidence to support the charge that he had seen a letter in the files of the Department of the Interior and of the committee, on which the President of the United States penned a note to the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the granting of patents in the Al Sarena mining case: *Provided,* That said committee be given the usual authority to make investigations, hold hearings, and make a report of their findings; *And provided further,* That all expenses of such investigations and the holdings of such hearings, not exceeding the sum of $1,000, shall be paid out of the funds heretofore authorized for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Chairman, overlong it has been customary for certain members of the press and certain columnists, some radio commentators, to sometimes directly, more often indirectly, challenge the integrity of the Congress as a whole, of Members of Congress, of its committees and members of its committee staff.

Overlong the Congress has been the whipping boy of certain individuals and of certain groups which make a practice of attributing unfair motives not only

to individual Members of the Congress but to the Congress as a whole.

In my judgment the Congress is itself in part to blame for this continued flow of false charges reflecting upon the integrity of individual Members of congressional committees, and of the Congress itself. We have failed to challenge these repeated charges.

Here where a joint committee is investigating the charge that because of influence at high administrative levels, timber valued at from $77 to $600 thousand was given away, that mining patents were granted, where 1 Senator and 2 Members of the House have been publicly named as having contributed to the influence which pressurized an executive department into the granting of the patents, the committee at the close of the hearings is informed through the public press and by one of its staff members that the President of the United States has improperly attempted to influence a Cabinet Member. We have the further charge through the press purporting to come from the same staff member, Mr. Redwine, that he, Mr. Redwine, told other members of the committee that he had seen a letter such as has heretofore been referred to and that he would swear under oath that he had seen it but that he had searched high and low and could not now find the letter. This same staff member, according to the newspaper reporter, added that that he had "found his file rifled."

Mr. Chairman, if charges involving the integrity of the Congress, its committees, its staff members, are to go unchallenged, then indeed there should be no complaint from any Member of the Congress of any statements which may hereafter be made and which reflect upon the integrity of the Congress for its proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress lacks either the inclination or the courage to resent scurrilous charges, as to its own integrity, it should in my judgment have the courage and the decency, when the integrity of the President of the United States is challenged, to sift those charges and when they are found untrue, as they will be if investigation is made, to hale the offender before the bar of the House where the Speaker may administer the proper rebuke.

The question here raised has nothing to do with the right of free speech, with the freedom of the press. The sole question is whether the Congress will without rebuke permit a committee employee, acting for and on behalf of an investigating committee, to falsely and publicly charge a President of the United States with misconduct, maladministration of his functions as President.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that there is one important angle involved in this debate relative to whether or not H. R. 3383, or the substitute bill which it is stated will be offered, shall now be enacted by this Congress which, in my judgment, has not yet been adequately discussed or clarified. It is the very important case now pending in the United States Supreme Court wherein Arizona, in 1952, brought suit against California, and joined as defendants therein, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Imperial Irrigation District, the city of Los Angeles, the Palo Verde Irrigation District, the city of San Diego, Coachella Valley Water District, county of San Diego, and others.

In that case Arizona sought to quit title to 3,800,000 acre-feet of water involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922, which involves the compact States. During this debate, we have been informed by the proponents of this bill that recently the United States Supreme Court has made a ruling that the upper basin States are not legally interested in the legal controversy involved in the case which Arizona brought against California as noted. I have not heard the decision read in this debate.

At the heart of this case in Supreme Court is how the States involved will have the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allotted to them each year by the 1922 Colorado River compact. It was quite logical that the upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would be fearful that this upper Colorado River project would normally be turned down by Congress if they should directly become involved in the pending suit which was filed by Arizona against California. I voted "aye" on the rule; not because I was for the bill but because I believe it important that this House have opportunity to debate this issue in all its phases.

I am sure that all of my colleagues in this great legislative body will naturally expect that we Representatives from southern California should expect to be, and will be, guided by the legal opinion of the distinguished attorney general of the State of California, Pat Brown, and by the able legal counsel of the Colorado River Association, officially representing the interests of the State of California in the Supreme Court litigation involving the rights of the State of California to any of the water rights involved in the Colorado River compact of 1922. And since both of these recognized legal authorities on water rights advise that the enactment of either H. R. 3383 or the substitute proposed would now be premature in their legal judgment, and would vitally jeopardize the substantial water rights of the water users in the State of California, I will not undertake to set myself up as knowing as much about the pending Supreme Court case as they do. The great 23d District, which I represent during this my 10th year in this legislative body, is in the very midst of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County in the very heart of the 6 million American citizens thereabouts; in the very midst of this thickly populated area which reportedly is growing faster than any comparative area in our beloved Nation. Without adequate water the very lives of them are in jeopardy.

I have recognized this debate as so important to the State of California and to the Nation that I have been here almost constantly throughout this debate, even though both of my two committees have been sitting each day both morning and afternoon.

During my 20 years of law practice before I first came to this great legislative body 5 terms ago, I concluded that it was a wise client who followed his counsel's advice. And, when the vote comes on this bill I expect to follow the expert legal advice and opinion of the legal counsel for the State of California.

For instance, in the hearings I read from the opinion by Mr. Ely, the attorney for the special agency set up by the Legislature of the State of California to protect the State's interests, as follows:

Article III (a) of the Colorado River compact, in a single sentence, apportions from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, which it states shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist. Manifestly this one sentence must have the same meaning in both the basins to which it refers. But there is controversy over the meaning of the term "beneficial consumptive use." The question is whether it means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or whether it means the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion at some point hundreds of miles downstream, in this case Lee Ferry. The same question arises under the Mexican Water Treaty's so-called escape clause. This question of interpretation of the Colorado River Compact and the Mexican Water Treaty is directly at issue in the present Supreme Court case. The quantity involved in this dispute, so far as the planning of the upper basin storage project is concerned, is 300,000 to 500,000 acre-feet, according to engineers' estimates. The Reclamation Bureau assumes that the measurement is to be made in terms of diversion minus return flow, measured at the place of use, with respect to California. The Boulder Canyon Project Act defines it in the latter terms, and the Mexican Water Treaty says (art. I (j)):

"'Consumptive use' means the use of water by evaporation, plant transpiration, or other manner whereby the water is consumed and does not return to its source of supply. In general, it is measured by the amount of water diverted less the part thereof which returns to the stream."

That corresponds with California's allegation of the meaning of the term in *Arizona* v. *California* (answer to Arizona, par. 8). Arizona denies that this definition applies to her uses (reply, par. 8), and the Reclamation Bureau, in the project before you, assumes that it does not apply to the upper basin, although the projects to be built under these bills are recognized as being subject to the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty.

Article III (a): Does the apportionment of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum in article III (a) mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year? Manifestly, as in the interpretation of "consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins.

California alleges in the pending lawsuit that the apportionment means a maximum, like a speed limit on a highway, not an average.

But if California is right, use by the upper basin in a given year of any quantity in excess of 7,500,000 acre-feet constitutes the use, to that extent, of unapportioned surplus, in competition with the appropriations of unapportioned excess or surplus waters which have been made in the lower basin, and subject to the Mexican treaty burden,

which, under article III (c) of the compact, is to be supplied first out of surplus. The amount involved in this particular issue is very large. It is more than 2 million acre-feet in extreme years, and averages about a million acre-feet in the 17 years of excess use in the upper basin shown in the Bureau's study.

And since I am advised by the legal counsel of our State that California cannot accept or recognize that the Supreme Court has made a final determination of all the important issues involved between California and the States to the compact of 1922, I cannot either feel comfortable or consistent in voting for this bill and against the legal advice of the distinguished legal counsel of my native State of California. There appears to be a substantial legal question which has not been resolved but will be in the not distant period.

In other words, gentlemen, as of this moment it is my considered position, that even though I readily recognize great merit in the natural desire of the other compact States to develop this great water resource, I take the position that until or unless the Supreme Court of the United States has first finally and fully resolved the legal rights of the State of California as compared with the other States to the compact, both the upper and lower States thereto, I cannot vote for this measure which the legal counsel of the State of California advises will jeopardize the legal rights of the State of California under the Colorado River Compact of 1922. I therefore take the further position that it would be shooting in the dark, for other Members of this great legislative body to vote approval for this important legislation until the Supreme Court of the United States has made its final determination of the meaning of the compact of 1922, as relates to quantities of water to which each of these compact States is entitled to; that vital existing compact which has been acted upon and relied upon these many years by the State of California in its water policy ever since 1922.

Therefore I must of necessity vote "no"; and if a motion to recommit this bill to the committee, pending the final decision of the Supreme Court in the premises is made, I will vote for the motion to recommit.

I not only take the position I do for the reasons already stated, but, also on account of the unanimous position, so far as I know, taken by the water users and agencies in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, which I represent.

For instance, here is a resolution of the city of Compton, opposing the upper Colorado River Basin project:

Resolution 6878

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Compton opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as provided in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas the city of Compton is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow the kinds of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Compton does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Compton in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Compton respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be air-mailed to our Congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

Adopted this 22d day of March, 1955.

FRANK G. BUSSING,
Mayor of the City of Compton.

Attest:

MRS. CLYDE J. HARLAN,
City Clerk of the City of Compton.

And, I have here a resolution by the nationally known manufacturing city of Vernon, in my Congressional District:

Resolution 1825

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Vernon opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

The City Council of the City of Vernon resolves as follows:

Whereas the city of Vernon is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes, if authorized, would furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

SECTION 1. That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Vernon in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed.

SEC. 2. That the city of Vernon respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

SEC. 3. The city clerk of the city of Vernon shall certify to the passage of this resolution and thereupon and thereafter the same shall be in full force and effect.

Adopted and approved this 19th day of April 1955.

R. J. FURLONG,
Mayor, City of Vernon.

Attest:

G. A. ANDERSON,
City Clerk.

Also as typical of many similar ones received, I have here a telegram from one of the most distinguished of California citizens, and a resident of my district, reading as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As a director of the governing boards of the Central Basin Municipal Water District and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California I am of course strongly opposed to upper Colorado River project bill and am convinced it should be defeated. We note you voted for rule to bring bill up for debate. We hope this does not indicate that you favor bill itself and earnestly ask you to vote against bill and do all possible to defeat it.

MILO DELLMANN.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "and for the improvement of navigation."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before wandering into other pursuits I obtained a college degree in engineering, and in the course of securing same, I studied quite a bit of geology. One summer during my undergraduate days I worked with a scientific expedition on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona and New Mexico, and in that summer I obtained quite a bit of close personal familiarity with the geology and the economics of that particular area. Now, I knew quite a bit about Chinle shale long before most of the gentlemen who have been talking about it here ever heard of it. In fact, I had a good bit of it ground into my hide during the course of that summer.

As a part of that work I rowed a small collapsible rowboat down the San Juan and Colorado Rivers from a point a few miles below Mexican Hat to Lee Ferry, Arizona—a distance of about 150 miles.

I make these prefatory remarks merely to indicate my familiarity with the subject. And, while I am reluctant to take up the time of the Committee this late in the debate, I think that there are a few things that are pertinent to this discussion which have not been said. For one thing there is a great quantity of silt presently flowing down the Colorado River and piling up behind Hoover Dam. At the time of the completion of the Hoover Dam, the Engineers estimated,

I believe, that in 75 years if something were not done to stop that flow, Lake Mead would be completely filled up and Hoover Dam would become useless. A great part of that silt, something over half of it, I believe, comes from the Navajo Reservation. The primary reason for that dates back to the 1870's when Kit Carson rounded up the Navajo Indians and took them out to Texas as a punitive measure: and then subsequently after 5 or 6 years, returned them to the Navajo Reservation.

At the time of their return they were given sheep and goats to use as their chief source of livelihood, to substitute for the hunting and raiding type of economy that had supported them previously. These sheep and goats very quickly overgrazed the reservation. Within 10 or 15 years an area which had, in part, been an area of considerable moisture, with natural lakes, trees, other types of vegetation, was turned into a denuded barren desert. The denuding of vegetation produced a very rapid runoff of the water, reaching as high as 98 percent in many areas so that with every rain came flash floods which quickly washed out the natural dams which had created the lakes, and provided natural water conservation. Now, every time it rains floods result and silt in great quantities washes into the San Juan River—principally—and through the San Juan into the Colorado. Erection of some kind of works to stop this flow of silt is absolutely essential to keep Hoover Dam from eventually becoming worthless; making it impossible, I might add, for southern California to get the water from it which they now are so dependent upon. But to do this effectively not only the Navaho and Glen Canyon Dams are needed but also an effective program of soil conservation on the Navaho Reservation. But before any such program can be at all effective, the Navaho Indians have to be converted from a nomadic, pastoral people dependent upon sheep. Some other means for their earning their livelihood must be found. These dams will provide that means. It will take them out of their present grazing economy, upon which most of them depend for their means of support now, and put them into industrial work, mining, truck farming, and things of that sort.

There is a great deal of coal on the reservation, also a great deal of uranium ores and if power is available, a lot of the present natural resources will be exploited.

But there is one other matter I would like to discuss and that is the matter of the effect of this project on crop surpluses. I believe a number of my colleagues, particularly from the Midwest, are fearful lest the land that is irrigated by this project will somehow or other come in competition with the lands in the Midwest where we already have serious crop surpluses.

I should like to point out that a good bit of this land which will receive additional water or be placed under irrigation for the first time by this project, is already cultivated by dry land farming methods and the principal crop is wheat. Once it is irrigated, it will no longer be used for wheat. They could not possibly support the cost of irrigated land through wheat production. The main thing produced will be vegetables and fruits and things of that sort which are not in competition with crops that are now in surplus. To reassure doubtful members on this point an amendment is to be offered, as I understand it, which would absolutely prohibit the use of any of this irrigated land for the production of crops in surplus for a period of years. So that, rather than adding to the crop surpluses this will cut the crop surpluses. The experience in the Columbia basin was that wheat production within the project area was cut in half.

Furthermore, I might say to my friends from the South that this water which California is so eager to hang onto, in many instances goes to irrigated land in California which grows cotton, and I am sure that we have enough of surplus cotton already. No cotton could be grown in the high and cool lands of the Colorado Plateau. For these reasons I feel that the upper Colorado project has value to the country as a whole, as well as to the States directly affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr., Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate the subject of uranium was brought into the debate by one of the gentlemen from the upper-basin States.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the past 10 years, I think I know something about that particular situation. I am proud to say that we are getting a lot of uranium from the Colorado Plateau and also from Utah. This is one of the great national safeguards for the continuance of the supply of uranium ore, but this ore is coming in without the benefit of the upper Colorado River Basin project. The mining of the ore does not require a great deal of water. It is being mined at this time and placed in great stockpiles at the processing centers. There has been no appearance before our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy asking that this Colorado River Basin bill be passed in order to obtain more ore from the Colorado Plateau.

I do not want to be visionary, and I have always been conservative on this subject of when we will get atomic power, but I want to give you some other people's testimony on this to back up my remarks.

Mr. Francis K. McCune, vice president and general manager of General Electric's atomic products division, had this to say in GE's progress report for May 24, 1954:

> Privately financed atomic plants will compete successfully with conventional power plants in 5 to 10 years.

He repeated this forecast in the July 12, 1954 issue of the Electric World. He discussed the feasibility and power cost of a 300,000 kilowatt boiling water reactor of a type suitable for one of our atomic facilities such as Hanford. Mr. McCune added that this boiling water type of reactor, which is a technical thing that I shall not go into, was one of the best suited for earliest and most effective competition with conventional fuel plants.

He estimated that where the coal plant production costs per kilowatt would be ordinarily about 6.90 mills, this boiling water reactor will produce power at about 6.70 mills, which is somewhat lower than steam.

This is the vice president of General Electric, whose business it is to make these reactors.

In 1954, Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, director of AEC's Division of Reactor Development, speaking before the Atomic Industrial Forum conference, urged the private companies to get moving on nuclear power, indicating that within 10 years economically priced atomic electric energy could be created. In April 1955, Dr. Hafstad's successor, Dr. Kenneth Davis, addressing the same group, stated that a thermonuclear power station built in 10 to 15 years will be as good as the best steam plant constructed today, and he estimated an installed kilowatt cost of between $125 and $140.

As to these tremendously expensive dams and generating plants in the upper Colorado Basin, it has been estimated by people who have testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that the installed kilowatt cost of generating plants will be from $200 to $705 capital investment, so you are getting a plant which is to the best of our knowledge and to the best of scientific knowledge an old-fashioned plant at a cost much higher than the present coal steam generating type of plant, which will cost about $150 per kilowatt capacity. The record of building cost right now at the Joppa plant down at the TVA is $190. I speak of the generating plant for the Atomic Energy facility at Joppa, Ill. Just across the river is a comparative plant that was built for $145. That is the present cost. You are talking, therefore, about electrical costs, which run from more, to as much as 3½ times as much as a regular coal generating plant would cost.

Remember, there are great coal deposits in the upper basin of the Colorado which are now being used to produce kilowatts at about 6 mills and which as generating plant's efficiency increases it will cost less. So what we are doing here is tying up a half a billion dollars in these hydroelectric generating plants on the river at a cost per kilowatt much more than it would cost to make kilowatts from uranium.

Long before these expensive projects are built cheap atomic power will be a reality. Long before these dams are built their justification will be much less than even the opponents of the bill can visualize.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, representing a district and residing in a State far removed from the Colorado River Basin, I hope I may be forgiven for asking two questions I think are important, at least to my constituents and to me and, perhaps, to

some others who are similarly situated. I realize that the President on yesterday made substantially this statement:

There was one feature of it—

Referring to this proposal, as I understand it—

that was originally controversial because of the belief on the part of some conservationists we would destroy wildlife in one section of the area. That dam, Echo Park Dam, has been eliminated.

It is my understanding that this provision remains in the bill as it passed the other body, but it is also my understanding that it has been eliminated in the bill that has been reported by our committee. I would like to ask the ranking member of the committee, if I am correct in that understanding?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The bill that was reported out of the committee, the new version, took out that provision unanimously. I think there is a tacit understanding on the part of the Members who are likely to be the conferees that it will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. That was my next question. Then those who will be the conferees will stand by the House version.

So that there may be no question in the minds of my constituents who are concerned about it, may I address the same question and receive this double assurance. Am I correct in understanding that the Echo Dam feature is out of the bill, as recommended by your committee and that the conferees, so far as the chairman can guarantee it to us, and I realize that it cannot be an absolute guaranty, will stand by the version as recommended by the committee eliminating that feature?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is correct. In addition there is an informal agreement with the Members of the Senate that Echo Park will stay out of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have made an effort to appraise all of the evidence and the contentions one way and another, the charges and countercharges and the whole case as I see it. I am satisfied on that basis that the clear weight of the evidence is in favor of this proposal, and I intend to support it. If I needed anything more, it would be what was said yesterday by the President of the United States when he stated, "I have more than once expressed my conviction before, that I believe that water is rapidly becoming our most valuable natural resource, and here is an opportunity, at last, to treat this whole great mighty Colorado River as a single entity, to treat it on a basin basis instead of merely a local and individual basis. We should get busy and get on to it." Then, in conclusion, he emphasized, "So again I hope that we can have positive action on that as rapidly as possible."

In my judgment, those of us who come from other parts of the country, who may not be benefited immediately or directly by the passage of this legislation, can well resolve any doubts in terms of the recommendations that have been made by the majority of the committee in the House and the emphatic endorsement which has been repeated as recently as yesterday, by the President of the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct about three inquiries to the chairman of this committee and to the ranking member as well. Like the gentleman who just preceded me, the district I represent will not be benefited directly by reason of the approval of this legislation. Nevertheless, as I said before, there are about three questions that I think are important in connection with the approval or disapproval of this proposed legislation. Since this legislation will cost a considerable amount of money, I would like to be informed whether any of the funds to carry out the provisions of this legislation, including the construction of the reservoirs, and whatever else is provided for in this bill, will come out of the Federal Treasury and charged to the taxpayers? May I ask the chairman of the committee whether that is so or not?

Mr. ENGLE. There is not any question about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much money will be used immediately from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ENGLE. It will cost about 55 percent, I think, of the total amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, almost all of these funds will be reimbursed.

Mr. ENGLE. They will all be paid back. What we said the other day was that the reclamation fund shall put up 55 percent of this money, $760 million. The balance will come out of the general revenues of the Treasury, and that will amount to something less than $18 million a year during the construction period of this project. All of that money is repaid, except something like $8 million. In other words, this project pays back over 99 percent of the capital. That portion which is allocated—nearly two-thirds of it—to the generation of power and municipal water is paid back with interest. That portion, which is about $283 million, for the irrigation feature, pays back in 50 equal annual installments, without interest, under the half-century old precedent of the reclamation law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the chairman has made it clear that the actual cost against the Federal Government, against the taxpayers of this country, finally will amount to about 1 percent, is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. I said the nonreimbursable is about 1 percent. A little over $8 million. But of course, if the gentleman wants to speak of the interest which is not being credited on the amount going into the irrigation development, of course that is an additional Federal subsidy, and that is traditional under the reclamation law as in all other projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question is this, whether or not any of the land that will be taken for irrigation purposes will be used for the purpose of producing crops in competition with crops that are presently in surplus. I have in mind especially wheat and corn, and other basic crops.

Mr. ENGLE. I have spoken on that twice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to make sure that none of the crops produced on this land will compete either directly or indirectly with the farm crops raised or produced in the Middle West. I have been given to understand that the effect of this legislation will really reduce the production of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice in this area.

Mr. ENGLE. Putting this land under irrigation, as in dealing with all sorts of dry land, has a tendency to move in the direction away from these surpluses. I cited to the committee during the discussion an example in the Columbia Basin, where 500,000 acres had been brought under irrigation to date, and that the acreage has been cut 90 percent. The major crop products giving our farmers trouble are, as you know, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the reason I make this inquiry.

Mr. ENGLE. Two of those are not raised in any quantity in this area. That is, corn and wheat. In my judgment, the taking of this area under water absolutely moves in the opposite direction from increased surpluses which are troubling the Commodity Credit Corporation and the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was going to try to clarify the phrase "traditional reclamation clause." When do they start paying back the $282 million for irrigation projects? Do they start paying concurrently on that or do they wait for 50 years after the dam has been paid for, and having it interest free during that period at the expense of the taxpayers? I was about to ask the gentleman if he would ask that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REES of Kansas was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The provisions of this bill provide that payment of the irrigation allocation shall start the first year immediately after the development period, whatever that may be. It cannot exceed 10 years, in accordance with the reclamation law. It will be paid annually in 50 equal installments thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have received a considerable amount of correspondence that this legislation is beneficial to the Navaho Indians. I know the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of this committee, is quite familiar with the acute situation with respect to the

Navaho Indians. It is a problem that concerns a good many of our people. A further statement from the chairman will be helpful.

Mr. ASPINALL. This legislation will be beneficial to the Navaho Indians. This legislation provides for the construction of the first facilities necessary to the ultimate irrigation of their land and the use by them of the waters to which they are entitled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I must first yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Kansas that much of this fund will be repaid in 19 years from irreplaceable natural resources of these four States, oil, gas, well leases, the reclamation fund, sale of public lands; and a total of $155 million more under irrigation costing $287 million.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much of that money—that is, $287 million or $155 million—is available for this project?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. It will be available when needed, $23.3 million that these four States will pay into the reclamation fund from natural resources.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is a very able gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman would want to ask somebody in charge of the bill, either the chairman or the ranking minority member how much this is going to increase Federal employment?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, can the gentleman point out how it would be possible to keep off the agricultural market the additional surpluses to be grown on more than 1 million acres of lands to be irrigated, and to be irrigated as supplemental irrigation? How can that be placed in separate warehouses or kept out of the general market depressing all prices throughout the country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] the chairman of this committee has just explained that none of the basic products, including wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco will be in competition by reason of this project. The chairman has just stated that the production of the products I have just mentioned will be less than they are at the present time under dry farming, this for the reason that the lands will be used for growing alfalfa to feed cattle produced in that area, and most of the remainder for vegetables and fruits that will be consumed in that part of the country. So, it appears from the explanation of those who are familiar with the problem there will be no competition with crops raised in the area that either he or I represents.

I would like to say one more word with regard to the importance of providing food for the Navaho Indians. I am told that alfalfa and other feed that may be raised in this area will be used to feed livestock presently controlled for the Navaho Indians.

We are also advised that a considerable share of the vegetables and other products will be used by the Navaho Indians and thus relieve a critical situation that has existed among the Indians over a period of years. We are informed that several hundred million dollars has been spent in the last few years to relieve an acute situation in respect to food and other products in order to help the Indians who have suffered by reason of lack of rainfall in this area.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there is, to be sure, some Federal aid involved in this program—a reasonable contribution by the Government to the general welfare of the Nation. It most assuredly is not the fantastic collection of currency that has been so blithely bandied about by omnipotent opposition groups.

The simple facts are easily established although I hardly expect them to dent the tarnished armor of those who gleefully exploit their own distortions. How established? The Federal budget as submitted weighs many pounds and has hundreds of pages of figures for every sort and kind of expenditures. In this fabulous collection of numbers, reclamation, and reclamation alone, is singled out for this claptrap about the poor taxpayer absorbing ever increasing burdens of calculated interest. I defy anyone to give any commonsense explanation to this glaring inequity on the part of these taxpayer-savers other than one and one alone. This yawning gap stands out as clearly as an ink spot on a white shirt—and that is, that all logic failing to defeat reclamation, this double-dealing dodge has been concocted to do the job. Any ordinary search would find literally hundreds of items in the budget which should, or could, bear this same damning defamation if it has any logical validity. By their acts—not their protestations—may you know them.

What are these items you ask—only these: Any item which by any definition could be a capital-type expenditure; roads, bridges, ships, buildings, harbors, flood control works, levees, soil building programs, and so on ad infinitum. If sudden-death interest is to apply to one capital-type expenditure—and its evil shouted from the rooftops and worn as a badge of honor by budgeteers—then it should apply to all. The use of this calculated-compounding and confusion in only one area marks it as a handy tool for gravediggers—all others failing.

Reclamation and reclamation projects do pay their way to the Nation. Irrigation is of demonstrable value, for without irrigation, the West would be the harsh desert that Webster thought it would always be. With water, however, the desert blooms and creates wealth. No more could be asked of any program and whether private or public—and three-fourths of all irrigation development is private. It is a good investment for America.

Bypassing for a moment opposition from the nonreclamation area, there is considerable merit and enlightenment in examining the main nest of opposition and interest interpreters—namely those who seem also to have an affinity for southern California. This well-organized and well-heeled group apparently feels that age lends honor to Federal aid for no Federal aid proposed in this bill differs in concept or design from that which helped nurture and develop southern California. Let me state clearly that I think that the very growth and advancement of southern California, which rests upon basic Federal water development, is the best argument in support of this legislation. In fact in their very opposition, they have gone so far overboard that reflection and commonsense will distill from their frantic propaganda the true need and worth of this program in the upper basin area which supplies all the water.

I shall return to this unveiling in a moment, but let us finish this Federal aid, or as some would describe it, a subsidy bugbear. The House bill, H. R. 3383, proposes a total expenditure of $760 million, of which less than 1 percent is on a grant or nonreturnable basis. The balance will all be returned to the Treasury. Of this return, approximately $463 million will be returned with interest so no slick shenanigans will distort that. The balance, represented by irrigation projects, will be returned without interest. This has been the law on irrigation projects since 1902 when such free spenders as Teddy Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and others supported this concept. It has not suddenly become evil—it just makes predetermined opposition sound more valid. The figures are broken down in the committee report on the bill and clearly show that this return will be accomplished on schedule and that even more than that, a surplus will remain for future development.

You have heard or have seen, due to the enterprise of the well-heeled opposition, all sorts of figures on the Federal aid involved. They are alike only in that they proceed from a similar distortion. Other than that, they are as elusive as a basket of eels and just as slippery. It is the hope of the digit-distorters that the shock will be enough that no examination will be made to check the validity.

I have no intention of entering this quagmire of quackery. Federal help of one form or another has been the rule and not the exception in this Nation since its first acts of funding the Continentals at par and establishing a tariff. We have such Federal aid right now in shipbuilding, in airmail, in airport construction, in agriculture, in mail service, in census service, and in rivers, harbors and flood control. If Federal assistance in such form is evil and an ever-compounding load upon the taxpayer, then let us in honesty and commonsense first make this assault upon those forms of aid which make no whit of direct return. Reclamation at least returns the principal.

I defy anyone to establish any morally sound argument that reclamation and reclamation alone should be battered by the brand of boondoggle when the very areas from which such branding comes sit in federally aided splendor.

Southern California parades its pious protest against erected evil in the upper Colorado project in complete indifference to the millions of taxpayer dollars the area has received without string or prospect of repayment for flood control, harbor improvement, and even a Federal program to let in some of its once pleasant sunshine through its own smog. Let us not be deceived by this smog blanket they are using to hide their own dependence upon help from the Federal Government as they seek to choke off legitimate development elsewhere of the very type they have heretofore supported, and will hereafter support when they are the beneficiaries. Their opposition has but one reason and purpose—one foundation. Southern California having received the manyfold benefits of grant development, like one flood-control project running to $348 millions, and reclamation development running to about $350 millions, to use water from a river to which she contributes not one drop, now trembles in terror lest this same type of valuable development occur elsewhere. They know from experience the value of basic reclamation development and they want it all for themselves and they seek by high-sounding means to prevent the fulfillment of a program they helped to conceive and supported, yes supported, until that day when its advantages were to accrue to others and not to themselves. This present dog-in-the-manger opposition runs counter to solemn agreements made by the State of California over a half-century. Small wonder that unprejudiced Californians refer to this resounding din as baloney. Inasmuch as they are receiving this same interest-free money for their development, and I, for one, am a strong supporter of their projects as Colorado Representatives have always been, I think that in good conscience they should either stop spreading propaganda or offer to amend their own projects to conform to their postulations about this one. I think also that they should honor their solemn agreements made in years gone by with the other States of the Colorado River Basin and not seek by present subterfuge to recapture what they solemnly agreed over the years was not theirs. Southern California contributes not one whit of water to the Colorado River—rather they approach it like a sponge to a puddle and seem to have a philosophy that it is better to take than to give as the States involved in this program are the source of over 90 percent of the water of the Colorado River; water divided by formal compact to the States now seeking to obtain use of their share.

Oh, it is great sport to eternally damn our dams now that all of theirs are built—now that their power turbines are spewing out electric power not unlike they spew out propaganda—now that they are able to grow and prosper from water from snow hundreds of miles and several States away. Yes, it is great sport, but how can it be squared with their own arguments over the years and their own acceptance of our support for their development. If there is an answer, I am not so constituted as to understand it. To me, agreement and understanding must remain binding.

Do not be deceived into thinking that all of this is brand new for it is all very old and the record and the facts exist for those who wish to check it. Recently, my distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, demonstrated his fairness by reviewing this record. It can be found on page 3299 of the RECORD for February 23. Some of the most able men of Colorado took part in the long negotiations which were thought to have stilled the controversy over the use of the waters of the Colorado—formalized in an interstate compact at Sante Fe in 1922. They went to their eternal reward firm in the conviction that settlement had been achieved. Perhaps it is best that they are not here to see the dog turn on the hands that fed it.

I wish I had time to bare this whole record so that this calculated cloud of confusion could be cleared away, but I have not. It would not even be necessary to bring it up had not former friends deserted the ship and, fat and sassy from Federal feeding, begun to pump out adverse propaganda. It is a case of opposition based on self-interest.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, normally I deplore the use of theatrical tactics in the consideration of a bill. However, yesterday we had such a demonstration in connection with Chinle shale.

I have here today a core taken out by a diamond drill near the proposed site of Glen Canyon Dam. It is Chinle shale, too. My colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has just told us he is a geologist of sorts, and I invite his attention to this shale sample.

When I have finished speaking I will drink the water in the glass into which I put this core and any other contents remaining in the glass.

You know, one of the really amazing things about this particular legislation——

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

Mr. UDALL. I do not have time; I may later.

One of the really amazing things about this particular legislation has been the showmanship displayed by the opponents of this legislation from southern California. I think we have had more humbuggery and more buncombe exhibited on this legislation than any I can remember for a long time. They have entertained us throughout and I think they will continue to do so. Of course, the great theatrical capital of the world, Hollywood, is located in southern California and I suppose it comes as second nature to our friends to put on these shows for us. In the phrase of the moment, their performance has been a "many-splendored thing."

Our southern California friends, as each of the issues has come up—whether a dam could be built, whether there were uranium deposits which would be flooded, et cetera—have had counterproposals and counterevidence, and it has been quite a diversionary show. I know you have followed it in the past year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In their attack on the Bureau of Reclamation—a magnificent body of engineers which has built 165 dams in this country in the last 50 years and never lost one, and that is consulted all over the world today on reclamation projects, in far-off Australia and in many other countries—they have attacked these engineers throughout. We have heard, just to give you a few illustrations, of collapsible dams, sliding canyons, counterpropaganda, counterblueprints, counterdams, counterengineers, countergeologists, counterhydrologists, counteragronomists, countereconomists, countergeographers, and countercartographers. Then, we had a comic strip in the RECORD featuring satire and broad exaggeration entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak."

Another entertaining strip was started later under the title "The Solid Gold Cadillac."

We have heard tales of boondoggling and mention of atomic reactors—of the just-around-the-corner variety—mind-reading, cloudseeding, and public-relations hypnotism. All of these things you have heard during the journey of this bill through the Congress. Then, too, there have been just plain old dead cats.

Why am I, from Arizona, here, as the southern Californians would say, betraying the lower basin States and my own State? I want to tell you why my Republican colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I have supported this bill. We regard the Colorado River Basin as a community. This community sat down many years ago to work out a development plan. Unfortunately southern California got ahead of us when work began. Why, then, are we here supporting this measure? Not because our State benefits from it but because we are keeping the agreement that our State made at that time. We are honoring it just as most of the gentlemen from northern California are honoring the agreement their State made. So we appear here and say to you: Do not break faith with these people in the upper basin of the Colorado. Let us give them the project and the development they were promised under the agreement of these seven States.

There we have the picture. Do not believe for a moment that if a dam is built anywhere above Hoover Dam, the water will deplete away, or evaporate away, or percolate away, or sneak off to some subterranean chamber as the opponents would have it. If the Bureau of Reclamation says you can build a dam at a particular place, you may rest assured that it will hold water and that it will be just as successful as the other 165 dams have been.

May I pay just two tributes which I think are well earned. I do not know of a more conscientious Member in this House, or one who works harder and longer on the business of the House, than the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. As-

PINALL]. I would like to congratulate him on the very remarkable and fair-minded job he has done on this bill. I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], for the high degree of water statesmanship he has shown in this matter. He has done great credit to himself and to his State in the manner in which he has handled this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to section 1 appearing in the printed report be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 8, following the word "and", insert the word "for." Strike the comma following the word "power."

Page 2, line 9, following the word "purposes", strike the words "hereby authorizes."

Page 2, line 10, following the word "Interior", insert the words "is hereby authorized."

Page 2, line 14, strike the words "Echo Park,". Following the words "Flaming Gorge", insert the words ", Navajo (dam and reservoir only),

Page 3, line 10, following the word "Silt", insert the word "and". Strike the comma following the words "Smith Fork" and insert a period in lieu thereof.

Pages 3, 4, and 5, strike everything beginning on page 3, line 11, through page 5, line 7.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navaho (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided*, That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Fla., Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork: *Provided further*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-LaPlata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided*, That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"In the event that the Secretary finds that the benefits of the Curecanti unit do not exceed its costs, he shall give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided*, That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project: (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period of years not exceeding the expected economic life of such unit or participating project but not to exceed 100 years;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the upper division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 percent; Utah, 21.5 percent; Wyoming, 15.5 percent; and New Mexico, 17 percent: *Provided,* That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the basin fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenue so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to this requirement there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this act in equal annual installments within a period not exceeding 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this act, (2) costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within a period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the basin fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. Costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by any participating project, and beyond the capability of such land to repay, shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Readjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navaho initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purpose of this act, but not to exceed $760 million.

"SEC. 13. In planning the additional development necessary to the full consumptive use in the upper basin of the waters of the Colorado River system allocated to the upper basin and in planning the use of and in using credits from net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payout of costs of participation projects herein and hereafter authorized in the State of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of such States of the fullest practicable consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River system consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to institute studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin of the effect upon the quality of water of the Colorado River, of all transmountain diversions of water of the Colorado River system and of all other storage and reclamation projects in the Colorado River Basin.

"SEC. 16. As used in this act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin,' 'Colorado River compact,' 'Colorado River system,' 'Lee Ferry,' 'States of the upper division,' 'upper basin,' and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

"The term 'States of the upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'upper basin';

"The term 'upper Colorado River Basin compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of

the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof; and

"The term 'economic life,' as used herein in relation to repayment of costs allocated to power, shall mean the period during which the unit or project is expected to continue to provide the power and energy contemplated from the design and construction of the power facilities of the unit or project, due regard being given to historical experience with similar types of works, allowances included in 'replacement costs' for replacing major items of equipment, and other pertinent factors which may affect the useful life."

Mr. ENGLE (interrupting reading of the substitute). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point, calling attention to the fact that a committee print has been made available to all Members and, in addition, the substitute amendment appears in the supplemental report filed by the committee on February 14, 1956, and has been available since that time with other explanatory matters for the Members of the House.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the chairman tell us what this particular parliamentary move is for? Is this a new bill instead of H. R. 3383? Is this a completely new bill?

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman had read the supplemental report, I think he would understand that we are trying to offer a series of committee amendments in an orderly way, and in order to do that, we have the permission of the House to file a supplemental report, which we did some 2 weeks ago, and incorporated the committee amendments in a substitute because that was the most orderly way to do it. Now, we could offer them from the floor one after another, but the way it is done here the Members of the House and of the Committee of the Whole have the whole document before them and they have the committee amendments in italics so they can identify them, and they have them all explained in the supplemental report.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They could be acted upon separately after the substitute is accepted?

Mr. ENGLE. No; except that the gentleman can offer an amendment to strike out any portion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I see.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, will the bill then be read section by section from Committee Print No. 10?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is offering is an amendment to the bill and it is considered in its entirety as an amendment. The gentleman from California has asked unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment, which is 7 or 8 pages long, I may say, be dispensed with.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then, Mr. Chairman, would an amendment to section, let us say, 7, be considered at the time section 7 of the committee print is read?

The CHAIRMAN. After the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is read in its entirety, the amendment is then open to amendment at any point.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment is the subject matter of the supplemental report which was filed with this House February 14, 1956.

As I explained to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] the reason we adopted this procedure is because we wanted to proceed in an orderly manner. There are several of these amendments which came up with reference to this very complicated piece of legislation after the original bill was voted out of our committee in July of last year. One of them deals with the protection of certain of the recreational and scenic areas involved, and the other major amendment deals with the execution of an agreement with reference to the repayment of this project. All of these amendments would be germane if offered separately and could have been offered separately, but we felt that the House would want to know that the committee considered these amendments and took formal action upon them. However, under the rules of the House, it is not possible to refer to action taken in any committee unless that action has been reported to the House.

So, as a consequence, in order to be able to discuss here in the House the action taken by the committee with reference to these amendments, it was necessary for us to file a supplemental report reporting on our action. We came on the floor of the House and secured the unanimous consent to file a supplemental report, and the supplemental report is before you, explaining the additional amendments that have been put into the bill, with the substitute bill set forth in the supplemental report on page 6 of that report, and then commencing on page 12 of the report each one of these amendments—and there are 9 of them all together to various parts of the bill—are described in detail with reference to what they do.

In addition to that, the bill is set forth in the report with strikeouts and italics in order to show the difference. In addition, for the convenience of the Members and those who might want to amend the substitute, which, of course, is open to amendment at any point now, the committee has provided a committee print No. 10 which is available to the Members, which sets up the bill, H. R. 3383, precisely as it was voted out of the Committee on the Interior with the amendments adopted at that time. The additional amendments referred to in the supplemental report are in italics and the change of language where it does occur is shown in strikeouts. That is done in order that any Member desiring to offer an amendment to the substitute may have a clear opportunity to do so.

The amendment proposed by the committee in its supplemental report incorporates all of the amendments recommended by the committee in its report of July 8, 1955, and which are set out in the Union Calendar Print No. 317, with the exception of one amendmend adding a new section 13; and as pointed out in the supplemental report, recent actions have made the inclusion of section 13 unnecessary.

This committee print shows, as I have said, the amendments that have been incorporated in the committee-recommended amendments set out in the supplemental report in addition to the amendments recommended in the initial report.

As I said previously, the amendments are discussed at page 12. Amendment No. 1 relates to the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Amendment No. 2 deletes a small project, the Woody Creek project in Colorado from those projects which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning. It is a change in the planning section and is not of any great importance.

Amendment No. 3 adds the Yellow Jacket project in northwestern Colorado to those which the Secretary would be required to give priority to in planning further developments.

The balance of these amendments have for their purpose effectuating the control agreement in the upper Colorado basin States with reference to management of their funds. It does not change the total repayment at all. It is a bookkeeping matter on which they got together and which is internal to their own problem. That subject matter is going to be discussed in more detail by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct in understanding that the changes to which the gentleman has referred are in italics on pages 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the supplemental report?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the Chairman tell the members of the committee just what hearings were held on the amendments which appear there in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that this whole subject matter was the subject of days and days and days of hearings and that these amendments were not any different from any other subject matter before the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee what hearings were held on the amendments which appear in italics?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that all the hearings that were held on this subject were on all of the amendments to this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to call the committee's attention to the fact that the amendments which you are now being asked to vote upon, particularly with reference to the division of revenues and other detailed provisions in the substitute, are amendments upon which there has been absolutely no testimony before any congressional committee. These are matters which were never considered by our committee and you are now being asked to vote upon them without their having been even discussed in the committee, except by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY to the committee amendment: At the end of the first full sentence of section 4 of the committee proposed amendment, which occurs, for reference in the committee print, at page 6, line 7, strike the period, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

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

Mr. ENGLE. We have no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment and in fact helps the legislation.

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

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no objection to the amendment. As I understand, it goes to surplus crops, and I think it has been shown that the wheat and corn lands are taken out of production by irrigation projects because very little wheat or corn is irrigated, less than 1 percent. I think the amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. AVERY. I thank both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Nebraska for their support of my amendment. It has been alleged on the floor of the House ever since I have been a Member that these reclamation projects do not bring new land into production of the basic commodities. I think that is basically true. That is why I have offered this amendment, only to write into the law what has been said on the floor of the House at such times as we have considered reclamation projects.

This amendment does not do all I would like to have it do. You note it only prevents the production of these basic crops for 10 years. When you get down to the fine print, we are not getting as much as I would like to have, because it will take probably 5 or 6 years to develop these projects, so actually all we have left is a 2- or 3-year guaranty. However, I think it is important that this House recognize now that we cannot promiscuously continue to bring new land into production of the basic commodities unless we give a look at what it is doing to our midwestern economy, where especially our small farmers are compelled annually to decrease their production of the crops that are so vital to them.

May I especially thank the gentleman from California, who has worked so hard on reclamation legislation for the Western States, for recognizing this problem. I appreciate his accepting the amendment.

Because of my intense interest in water conservation I want to support the legislation before the House this afternoon. However, in its present form I do not feel that in justice to the farmers in my district that I could vote in favor of the bill. As I stated before, it is always alleged when the House is considering a proposal to reclaim and furnish water to new acres of land that these acres will not be placed in competition in the production of crops that are raised in the Middle West. That contention is probably true, but if it is true we should make provision in legislation authorizing further reclamation projects that crops competing with the Middle West cannot be produced. This is especially true under present conditions when the farmers of northeast Kansas are being required to reduce their acres of wheat and corn, the two principal crops in our district. It is for this reason that I am presenting this amendment to the House this afternoon and urging its adoption. I can understand the reservations on the part of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who has rendered great service to the irrigated sections on the western slopes of Colorado. He tells me that he feels like it is discriminating against this project to include such an amendment, when similar projects previously authorized have not had this restriction placed on them.

However, that should not preclude the adoption of this amendment this afternoon because our surplus of basic commodities is more critical than any time in our history. Just because this restriction is a few years late in being adopted by Congress in the authorization of reclamation projects does not justify the further delay of writing it into the legislation we are considering today. The farmers in my district are more in need of such protective legislation than they have been at any time in the past. As I stated earlier in my remarks, this amendment does not do all that I hoped to accomplish by its submission.

In prohibiting the production of basic crops for 10 years, the prohibition naturally would only apply to 2 or 3 years, as these projects will probably not be completed to the stage where the reclaimed acres would be placed into production until about 6 or 7 years from now. I had hoped to get agreement on a 20-year prohibition but the committee was unwilling to accept the amendment for a period of that duration. Therefore we have compromised on the 10-year provision as read by the clerk, and I am asking that it be adopted, in order that the Congress go on record as recognizing the inequity of spending public funds to bring additional land into production when the farmers of my district are faced with extremely low acreage allotments.

As I stated before I feel that water conservation is of top priority to this Nation. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in its report to the President states that the water needs of this country by 1970 will be twice as great as they are today. In view of this carefully prepared report I feel it is imperative that water be stored in every instance that it is economically feasible. This program I feel is justified as it is not disrupting the social and economic conditions of the area. Practically no persons will be displaced by these reservoirs, and the land being inundated is of small value other than its scenic value. The benefits occurring from these projects will be distributed among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona. Since much land in these States is still public land I feel these States are justified in their request for the authorization of this project. This is especially true in lieu of the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that less than 1 percent of the cost of the entire project will not be reimbursable to the Federal Government. These repayments will come from water rights and power sales.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so for this reason. It is nugatory except as to the Paonia project. I believe it was the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] who stated yesterday or the day before that there would not be any production out of this entire group of projects until beyond 10 years from now except possibly on the Paonia project. Paonia has in part been authorized before. As I understand it, it was more or less a bringing together of new portions of it along with the old.

I think the effect of the amendment would be unfair with respect to the people in that particular area. It therefore should not be in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to understand why this amendment is before us. If basic crops cannot be grown on irrigated lands, why have the amendment at all? The fact is, of course, that you can grow basic crops on irrigated land. The fact is you can grow feed grains and compete with my part of the country. That is what I am interested in.

I do not care two hoots in a vinegar barrel about this fight between southern California and the intermountain area. I was interested to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority floor

leader, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] make their speeches yesterday morning in behalf of this bill. I did not know that Massachusetts has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that the State of Indiana has all the industries it wants or needs. I did not know that they do not have an agricultural problem in Indiana. We have an agricultural problem in Iowa, and we need industry in Iowa. This bill, providing the cheap power that it does, means that industry will move out to that part of the country and not into the State of Iowa. We cannot get industry in Iowa. Industry will follow this power; and agricultural production will follow irrigation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, one of the basic crops is corn, which is raised in abundance in the State of Iowa, and this amendment provides that no corn is to be raised and put into the competitive market, and the gentleman should be happy that we have the amendment and he should support it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it makes the bill just a little less worse—that is all—just a little less worse.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is that the reason the gentleman is opposing the amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is the reason.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman know what the six basic crops are?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Let us have them.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the gentleman tell me?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Colorado is on the Committee on Agriculture. He ought to know the six basic crops.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that only 40 percent of the corngrowers in his own State subscribe to the agricultural program, and 60 percent of them grow their corn outside of the basic act? What have you got to bellyache on that?

Mr. GROSS. We want that market for our feed grain instead of your producing it with money that is provided by all of the taxpayers of the United States to irrigate your land.

Mr. HILL. I do not have a foot of irrigated land, but I just wanted to be sure that we know what we are talking about.

Mr. GROSS. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that the gentleman from Colorado yields to me.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa wants to go back to Iowa and tell his farmers that he is in favor of subsidizing all of the corn production?

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the bill.

Mr. AVERY. What is the gentleman going to do about this amendment? That is the question we are debating here.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote against the amendment because, in my opinion, it is a subterfuge to sell this bill to the people from the Midwest. We are not only interested in agriculture. We are just as much interested in industry as anybody else. We need industry in Iowa. But you are drawing industry out of our part of the country and other parts of the country because of the power that will be generated.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I cannot quite follow the gentleman in this discussion and understand how he twists my amendment around so as to apply it to power, which is provided by these projects.

Mr. GROSS. In the first place, your amendment is limited to 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. I so stated on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. If Ezra Benson has his way, and I refer this to his colleagues from Utah who are here supporting this bill—if Ezra Benson has his way he will have the farmers of Iowa liquidated in 10 years, and I do not intend to let that happen. Of course, we can throw the gates open and let irrigated farms in the West produce what we ought to be producing in the State of Iowa. But I am not going to stand here and be a party to gutting Iowa farmers now or at the end of 10 years.

Mr. AVERY. Would the gentleman care to amend my amendment so that it would be extended to 20 years?

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in amending any amendment to this bill. I am going to vote against it.

Mr. AVERY. I believe the gentleman so stated just a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I did.

Mr. AVERY. But it seems to me that with this amendment, if the corn farmers are going to be gone in 10 years that without the amendment they might be gone in 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. I said that if Ezra Benson had his way the farmers of Iowa would be liquidated in 10 years or less.

Mr. AVERY. I do not recall that my amendment applied to Mr. Benson.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that eventually we can impress upon some people in Washington that we are in trouble and we can head off the liquidation of farmers that is now taking place in Iowa.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. GROSS. We stand today upon the threshold of power generation through the use of nuclear energy. Plants for the generation of electric power through the use of atomic energy need not be located in the Rocky Mountains. Plants for this purpose can and should be located in the Midwest, where we need a balance of agriculture and industry—where there are already abundant food supplies at hand to feed industry.

There is no need for further agricultural production. Existing farms and farmers are abundantly capable of supplying the Nation's needs for food and fiber, and for many years to come. There is absolutely no need at this time to spend perhaps $3 billion on such a project as this, either from the standpoint of power or agricultural production.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to the upper Colorado River project. My position on the record will show that I am convinced that his project is not economically feasible nor is it consistent with sound reclamation procedures.

There have been many cogent arguments advanced in opposition to this legislation.

Concurrent with the consideration of this legislation is the problem of vast agricultural surpluses. The President has submitted to the Congress for consideration a solution to these agricultural surpluses which I heartily endorse.

Since vast surpluses have not only burdened the economy with subsidies running into billions but have partially darkened the farm economy with a cloud of falling prices, it has been necessary for the sponsors of such reclamation projects as these to invent a means of justification based upon pure speculation of future needs.

The favorite date when they say that the grim spectre of famine will come—unless we heed their advice—is 1975. To meet the vast appetitie of 200 million people in that year, the Bureau of Reclamation asks that before 1959 there be authorized and initiated the irrigation of 1,400,000 new acres and that there be supplementary water provided for 1,711,700 acres now irrigated and in cultivation. For this the minimum construction cost would be $2,110,834,000—a per-acre cost of $700.

Reference to authorities in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere will show the utterly groundless nature of this claim for more irrigated land, in 1975 or any other year. Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall and, in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from $50 to $150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber.

The distribution of this presently existing "soil bank" is as follows:

	Acres
South	
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338
Southeast	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519
Midwest	
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

This, I repeat, is a soil bank already in being. But with production bursting at the seams on the land already cultivated, this reserve need not be touched for years to come.

Indeed, the necessity now faces the Congress to put more millions into the reserve. This is what is meant by the soil-bank plan submitted by the President to Congress. That would retire 40 million acres which are now in cultivation. This will mean that between the American people and the famine portrayed by sponsors of more irrigation, these are no less than 61 million potentially productive acres.

Even to consider irrigating the 1,228,000 acres in the Colorado Basin contemplated in S. 500 while we are attempting to eliminate 40 million that we do not need is a matter so irrational as to suggest that it could only happen in the mystic land of political legislation the land in which regional and bureaucratic ambitions are paramount and the national interest is forgotten.

But the proponents of this project have apparently convinced some people, including themselves, that the crops to be raised upon these high arid slopes are a very special kind of crops—rare, exotic, never to be in surplus, and highly essential to the Nation's welfare. The reality is that the produce to be raised will be just like the crops that are raised on millions and millions of acres now in cultivation. They are mostly grains, dairy products—from the cattle which eat the forage which is to be raised on the land and which the proponents say is not in surplus—and wool from the sheep which also partake of the said forage.

Because the reclamation of these additional acres will only serve to compound the expense and proportion of the existing agricultural problem, I oppose the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 16, delete section 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. The impounding and use of water for the generation of electrical power and energy at all such facilities in the Colorado River Basin, shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes, and the United States shall not withhold water in storage in contravention of this mandate. In the event that any State of the Colorado River Basin seeks to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce any of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Mexican Water Treaty or of this act, consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit. Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit, action, or proceeding brought in any court of competent jurisdiction upon any cause of action arising under any contract lawfully entered into by the United States pursuant to either of the compacts or the acts named in this section."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I offer this amendment in view of the fact that in southern California we are a little bloody at this time. But the purpose of this amendment can be simply stated.

In section 7 of the committee amendment which you will find on page 12, you will find that there are certain rights that are guaranteed. However, there is no machinery set up to enforce section 7.

On page 16 you will find them more or less reiterated in section 14. My amendment is a redrafting of section 14 in order to give to the States the things which they say are provided in section 7. It seems to me that if anybody is really sincere in saying that they meant that they said in the language of section 7 and section 14, there can be absolutely no objection to the amendment which has been offered. We have simply spelled it out and we have provided the machinery and we have made it apply to the entire act instead of just to section 14.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman mind stating why he did not submit this amendment to the committee so that it could have been considered? These are very technical matters. The gentleman says it is a very fair and a very good amendment, but he drops it upon our desk 5 minutes before he is supposed to offer it. We do not regard that as the way to present legislation of a very technical nature. I think it goes to the question of whether or not the gentleman wanted us to have a good look at it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not have your substitute amendment available for consideration until the last moment yesterday. Yesterday was the first time I could get it. I discussed the amendment with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. It was available to you many days ago. It is very simple. It would take about 10 minutes to read and understand it.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I note in the last line that "Consent is hereby given to joinder of the United States as a party to any suit."

Does not this point up the whole thing to a lawsuit between the Lower Basin States, which could be very complicated and be in the courts for many years?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Section 7 already directs that local contracts shall not be impaled. My language makes it possible for machinery to carry out section 7 exactly as it is worded in section 7.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just why is this amendment necessary?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because there is no machinery provided in section 7 to carry it out, and unless it is provided all you have done is to write in a pious hope without giving the injured parties any recourse.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. To clarify the point as to whether this committee has had this matter before it or not, it is the substance of an amendment I offered in both the subcommittee and in the full committee during the hearings on this bill with respect to enlarging the opportunities for justice in case the Secretary conducts his operations under this act in violation of the law and the contract rights of all those who are involved on the river.

As the gentleman has said, it is a very fair thing to provide machinery for the quick decision—as quick as you can get out of the courts—of what may be in issue in connection with the Secretary's activities.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Just a statement substantiating that made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], that we have had this before our committee in various forms, and each time it has been voted down by approximately a vote of 20 to 6.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then the objection of my friend from California is withdrawn, that he has not had time. I assume you have had plenty of time to consider it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I understood my chairman to say that he had not seen this particular version. That I think is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. The way these legal sharpshooters who have made a living for some 25 or 30 years out of interpreting the various acts on the Colorado River take each word and turn it endwise, edgewise, sidewise, and flatwise to see what it means or does to the basic law of the river—any change in language requires the most microscopic attention, and I regard any language that comes in as different, as new language.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman would just let me use some of my own time I would like to proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. I assure the gentleman I will be very glad to seek additional time for him.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have been presented here with a substitute amendment; it is quite voluminous and is in substitution of the bill. In place of reading each one of the sections, as is ordinarily done, to give the membership a chance to look at these different sections, to scrutinize them, we are presented with them en bloc.

It seems to me that the gentleman's request is a normal request that his amendment be considered, and I would ask at this time, if the gentleman will yield for that purpose, to have the amendment reread; because, as I understand the amendment it seeks to furnish machinery to do just exactly what they claim they want to do in section 14 where it says, "Consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits."

And again the same language is used in section 7, the same identical language is used there. It seems to me that language is also the permission of a State to have access to the courts.

As I understand, the gentleman's amendment just provides explicit means by which that consent can be obtained without difficulty.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is quite right; and I want to reemphasize exactly what he said. You are asked to vote a substitute amendment today without a chance to read it, without a chance to have it read to you, but it is objected now that this amendment should not be considered merely because the chairman of the committee has only had perhaps a couple of hours to actually look at it.

Let me say also to the chairman of this committee that if these are legal questions, I would point out that this whole bill is a legal matter; and if it provides the machinery to enforce what this bill purports to say, certainly it is only fair that the machinery should be spelled out and that the parties concerned should have an equal right to protect themselves under the terms of this act; and that is all that this amendment does: Gives to the various interested parties the machinery through which they can protect themselves in case there is any violation of this act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has taken only part of article 4, the Colorado River compact, which is already covered in this bill. If the Colorado River compact is covered in this bill, as in sections 7 and in 14, what is the necessity for the gentleman's amendment save and except to put the State of California in a position to institute a lawsuit that it may not have at the present time?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. The gentleman quite misreads it. I emphasize a certain part of the compact in order that it can be made very clear that the Congress does not mean in any way to change the compact. So we have emphasized that. However, it applies to all of the States in the lower basin and it would apply equally, I might add, to the upper Colorado River States because, to give you an example, suppose some of this water or some of these dams that are not for agricultural purposes were being stored in dry times and that water was held behind those dams and the water was not made available for agricultural purposes, under this language it would be right and proper for the agricultural interests to insist that the storage of that water should cease and desist until the agricultural purposes have been taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman if it is in the compact at the present time and you have copied only a part of it, why does the gentleman then bring it in so that a lawsuit could be instituted only on one phase of it when, as he says, it is already in there? Why do you single out this particular one phase?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is one phase which has been in dispute between those who would build these dams solely for power and those who would feel that the consumptive rights of those for domestic and agricultural purposes must be protected in both the upper and lower basin.

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

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

Mr. ENGLE. Under the interpretation by the Southern California lawyers, if this language is put in the bill it would be illegal, would it not, to build Glen Canyon?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; it would not be illegal to build Glen Canyon. It would be illegal to store water in the Glen Canyon dam so that enough water would not come down the river and the people in Arizona and the other areas in the southern basin would not be able to get sufficient water for their agricultural and consumptive purposes.

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] touched on the vital point of this amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to block us from building any storage dams in the upper-basin area, particularly the Glen Canyon Dam. This amendment is very ingeniously devised to do that very thing. Those of us who have listened to the testimony of Mr. Ely and the other counsel from southern California know that their contention has always been that we cannot use this water for any other purpose than what they term beneficial consumptive use, which means we cannot store it to produce electrical energy. All we can do is drink it and irrigate our lands. We cannot store it. That is the purpose of the amendment. The gentleman in order to achieve that end is asking you to take a provision out of the Colorado River compact and write it into this act.

I want to remind you again that on page 14 of the substitute this clause is contained:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act or the Colorado River compact.

So the effect of that provision is to make the Colorado River compact a part of this act. Why we should take one particular provision out of context from the compact and write it into this act is not understandable at all. If you are going to put one provision in we might as well write the whole compact into the bill. What the committee has done is to attempt to make this act subject to the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact. What the gentleman proposes to do is to pick out one part that he likes and take it out of context and make it subject to the interpretation that counsel for southern California has attempted to apply to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to direct your attention to the fact it is part of article 4, section B, of the Colorado River compact, only part of it, but then he slides these words in front of it saying "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." Now, that part is not article 4–B, because article 4–B says "subject to the provisions of this compact the waters in the Colorado River." You see, the trick is in slipping in and substituting the words "impounding and use of the water for the generation of electrical power and energy." They try to evade the provisions of the Colorado River compact itself which their signatories agreed to, and that is what it amounts to. Therefore, it should be voted down.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I further call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 16 there is this provision:

> In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply—

That is, with the provisions of the upper Colorado River compact—

> any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits.

So they have the right to come into court if there is a violation. There is absolutely no reason for this amendment, and I hope you vote it down.

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, is it not, that this kind of language could be the basis of a lawsuit that would tie up and frustrate and stop the construction of this project?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Undoubtedly there would be a lawsuit the day after this bill is passed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], has seen fit to offer his amendment, because it smokes out what I have known for a long time but have been unable to get the upper Colorado advocates to admit, that this is not a reclamation project. This is a public power project, with some incidental benefits. And, can you not see the proponents striving and screaming immediately that they do not want this amendment because it will interfere with power? If the provisions of the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has offered are actually accepted and incorporated in this bill, it will compel the Secretary of the Interior to operate this entire project not as a power project as the folks in the upper basin want it to be, but he will have to operate it as an irrigation project. Therefore you will see the proponents unanimously united against this amendment because they are not interested so much in reclamation. They want this a power project, and that is what it is. I congratulate the gentleman from California for having offered his amendment. I think it should be put in the bill, because it at least shows just what the purpose of the upper basin is—not to provide reclamation but to provide power.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just simply say that in the reading of article 4–B of the compact, I think it can be twisted, as I think it has been twisted, but I think the words are very plain and should be read again: Subject to the provisions of this compact, which means the division of the waters, water of the Colorado River may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent the use for such dominant purposes. My amendment makes it possible to enforce that part of the section and make sure that this will not be used, and what other purpose can Echo Dam be built for except for power purposes at the expense of agriculture and consumptive uses? They just cannot answer that question.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman is entirely correct, because the proponents have admitted, when they build Glen Canyon Dam, it will not put one drop of water on an acre of land. This is strictly a power feature and the principal part of this bill.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. The language which has just been called to our attention, which was read by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is in the bill. It is the last sentence of section 7. It reads:

> Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law, of waters apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River basin.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that I know that is in the amendment and if the proponents of this proposed piece of legislation really believed it, they should not object to having placed in the bill the mechanism for putting it into effect.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is redundant; that is what it amounts to. May I also say this, if the gentleman will be good enough to yield further, that the reason it is necessary to store the water, as the gentleman knows, is that the upper basin States are unable to use this water because of the erratic flow of the river; the water comes off in a very few weeks, in the late spring and early summer, and unless we are placed in a position to catch the water, the lower basin water, so that we can deliver it in conformity with the provisions of the Colorado River compact to the lower basin, then we are unable to build the necessary small reservoirs in the upper basin so that we can use the water later in the summer during the growing season. That is the reason for all of this.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that although the present bill consents to suits against the United States, it does not provide for the joinder of the United States in situations where you have suits between States of the basin. Of course, the Supreme Court decision in 1936 said it was essential for the United States to be joined in such suits and as a consequence, if it is essential, you should provide for it here. Otherwise you are preventing the disposition of proper legal questions. Likewise the amendment also provides in cases that arise in connection with power contractors—and that is where most of the litigation, if any would arise—they would have the similar privilege of coming into court, bringing the proper parties in.

I ask you gentlemen if in the United States you are going to permit people to go to court and have their rights litigated, which is a part of our Constitution, why, for goodness sake, is anybody objecting to providing the machinery for doing it? That is all that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] seeks to do. I urge very seriously the adoption of this amendment. It has a good purpose and it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this late stage in the consideration of this measure to trespass upon the time of the Committee. I think it should be said, however, that the debate on this bill has been thorough; it has been of high quality; it has been energetic and at times controversial. I think nevertheless it is fair to state that it has not been sectional and it has not been partisan. Those who have supported the bill have proceeded upon the theory that what is good for any great section of the country is good for the country as a whole.

It has been pointed out over and over again that this bill had the support of the previous administration, and it has the support of the present administration. It has passed the Senate by a sizable majority; it has wide, substantial bipartisan support in the House.

Without adding a partisan flavor to this debate, I think I can say to my colleagues on my side of the aisle that the development of the upper Colorado is consistent with the long and proud record of Democratic Congresses which have lent their support to the development of the great water and soil re-

sources of all sections of the country. In the 1952 Democratic platform, the following specific pledge was made to the American people:

The Democratic Party is dedicated to a continuation of the natural resources development policy inaugurated and carried out under the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and to the extension of that policy to all parts of the Nation—North, South, East, Midwest, West, and the Territories—to the end that the Nation and its people receive maximum benefits from these resources to which they have an inherent right.

Our party has supported the development of the Tennessee Valley, the Pacific Northwest, New England, the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys, and the great projects in the lower Colorado region. We have supported the conservation of our soil and water resources in every State in the Union. We have favored consistently the development of all of our natural resources and their full utilization for the benefit of all the people of our country.

It has been suggested that the development of the upper Colorado will add to the burdensome farm surpluses which now depress farm prices. The amendment to which the committee has agreed renders that argument moot. Personally, I doubt that any such amendment is necessary. With our expanding population and with the ever improving diet of the American people, the question of surpluses can only be a temporary one. The fact that surpluses exist today is no argument that there will be surpluses 5 years from today. Within the last 5 or 6 years we have seen surpluses come and go. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense were calling upon farmers to increase their production of wheat, cotton, corn, and other agricultural products and to reach unprecedented goals. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that the cotton supply situation was such that an embargo was placed upon the exportation of cotton from the United States. It was only 5 or 6 years ago that farmers and stockmen were being encouraged to increase their cattle production. I recall very well that at that time the Office of Price Stabilization was undertaking to roll back the price of beef. My colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture will recall that our greatest problems at the beginning of the Korean war were those which related to efforts on the part of the administration to hold down the prices of farm products and to encourage farmers to increase their harvests.

The principle of the soil bank recommended by the Department of Agriculture and many others is not simply one of reducing the surpluses of today, but of preparing for the shortages of tomorrow. The great undeveloped West is the greatest soil bank in America. The diet and health standards of future Americans require us to initiate the long-term development of the upper Colorado region now.

The committee has done an excellent job in working out the controversial features of this measure in eliminating Echo Park Dam and in strengthening and improving the bill generally. I urge my colleagues to support the committee substitute and on final passage to vote for the bill as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On Monday of this week, the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the House Committee on Agriculture the administration's farm program. It is now available as a Committee Print; that is, the administration farm program. I was able to obtain a copy of it only yesterday and I regret that I did not recall one provision in the bill when I had the floor a few moments ago. That is my reason for taking the floor now. It is to point out that in the administration farm bill, corn is removed as a basic commodity.

The amendment adopted a few minutes ago applies only to basic commodities. This simply means that if the administration's farm program becomes law, and corn is dropped from the list of basic commodities, the principal feed grain crop in Iowa will have no protection whatever under the amendment.

This administration on one hand supports legislation calling for the taking of land out of production in the Middlewest and on the other hand supports this legislation that will put vast areas into production. And adoption of this 10-year amendment is the worst kind of a sop to those who come from the great corn-growing areas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR as a substitute for the committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in order to provide for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain a dam in or near Glen Canyon, Ariz., together with a powerplant, incidental works, and necessary main transmission lines to load centers, hereinafter referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam project: *Provided*, That as part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument and (2) to make the net revenues collected in the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project available to the States of the upper Colorado River basin to construct irrigation projects as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'basin fund'), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Glen Canyon Dam project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, and (2) expenditure as authorized by subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be made available to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin for the exclusive use in constructing whatever irrigation projects (including incidental power generating and transmission facilities) that the States may choose to construct or have constructed within their respective boundaries: *Provided*, That the revenues in the Basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be apportioned to the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, to wit: 46 percent to the State of Colorado; 17 percent to the State of New Mexico; 21.5 percent to the State of Utah; and 15.5 percent to the State of Wyoming: *Provided further*, That whenever a State of the upper Colorado River Basin no longer is able to use for the construction of irrigation projects the revenues in the Basin Fund available to it, such revenues shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(e) The several States shall submit annual business-type budgets to the Secretary of the Interior reflecting the expenditures of revenues made available to the States from the Basin Fund for the construction of irrigation projects.

"SEC. 3. The only limitation on the use of the revenues from the basin fund by the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin shall be that the revenues must be expended for the construction of irrigation projects. The Secretary of the Interior shall have no authority to designate which irrigation projects shall be built with the use of revenues from the basin fund, nor shall he have any discretion to withhold funds for the construction of any irrigation projects that the several States of the upper Colorado River Basin or each of them may choose to construct or have constructed.

"SEC. 4. The entire cost of constructing the Glen Canyon Dam project shall be nonreimbursable, but operation and maintenance costs shall be paid from revenues from the sale of power generated by the project, as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 5. No dam, irrigation project or incidental unit thereof may be constructed pursuant to authority of this act, or with revenues made available by this act, by the Secretary of the Interior, or any State or subdivision thereof, within the boundaries of a national park or monument.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the Glen Canyon Dam project, the Secretary of the Interior shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation projects constructed in the upper Colorado River Basin pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with the other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, or any contract lawfully entered into under said acts without the consent of the other contracting parties. Neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Glen Canyon Dam project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes, pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 9. Before any money is appropriated for the construction of the storage units, powerplants or participating projects named in this act, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for revenues by contract, in accordance with the provisions of this act, adequate in his judgment to insure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of said works incurred by the United States and the repayment within 50 years from the date of the completion of said works, or all amounts advanced under this act for such works, together with interest thereon made reimbursable under this act.

"SEC. 10. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provision of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. Consent is also given to the joinder of the United States as a party if suit is brought against any State or subdivision thereof because of the construction, operation or maintenance of any project constructed pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country.

"SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $421,270,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, some Members on the Republican side of the aisle said yesterday that they certainly felt that, since the lower basin had been given a great many advantages in the years gone by, it was entirely unfair to vote against the improvement of the upper basin. Therefore, I have offered a substitute which, I think, will more than amply take care of the upper basin.

You have had the proponents of this legislation tell you just how good it is, just how much it will pay back, even though they have formulas which have never before been used in any reclamation project. The proponents have figures which will extend it until your great grandchildren will never see the end of it, and they try to tell you it will not cause a drain upon the United States Treasury and that it will all be paid back.

They have come up with some fantastic figures and shown you some tremendous charts indicating that all this money that is going to be used will come out of the reclamation fund, and that some of the Western States produce it. This is the first time that I have ever known that the public lands in the Western States belonged to those Western States. I certainly believe it is about time, if that is the case, that some of the folks on my right change their tune about the giveaway, because they belong to the Western States. Therefore, since they belong to the Western States, my amendment is a bigger giveaway outside of foreign aid than anybody else has ever heard tell of.

This amendment offers to the for upper basin States the sum of $421,270,000 from the United States Treasury without the upper basin States being obliged to pay back 1 penny. I do this because I do not believe this project will ever pay back 1 penny to the United States Treasury, so the cheapest thing for the United States to do is to give them an outright grant. This amendment provides that they can build without returning a cent all of the facilities that are necessary for the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam and the power facilities in conjunction with it.

This amendment further provides that you can take all of the revenues from here on into perpetuity that are to be produced by hydroelectric power, and build all of the facilities that each of the upper basin States desire until they have the full utilization of the waters allocated to the upper basin. I am willing to accept the upper basin division of the revenues. Then they can build anything in the upper basin that they want to.

The one thing my amendment provides which they will not like, and which I say tests their sincerity, is that they cannot come back to the Treasury of the United States, they cannot come back to the Congress and ask for 1 more penny to develop the upper basin.

I defy anyone here to show, outside of foreign aid, where any State or States have received for reclamation such a proposition as I now offer, but I feel certain that, as I saw in the committee when I offered this same amendment, we will find united action by the upper basin saying "they do not want it."

They do not want it because they know the upper basin project is no good. They know that the industry feature cannot pay out. They know that they cannot even build Glen Canyon Dam. They know that all of the engineering features that have been talked about and the tremendous amount of engineering that has been done has been done at a place known as Mile Four or exactly 4 miles above Lee Ferry. And what the Bureau of Reclamation discovered there at Mile Four is that the type of strata that is found in that area is not sufficient upon which to build a dam. They cannot build a dam there so they moved up the Colorado River 11 miles. Now they are up to Mile Fifteen. It was only because some of the men down at the Bureau know that this project cannot be built and that they cannot build a high dam at Glen Canyon, they came to members of the committee and gave us these facts. Then we asked the Bureau of Reclamation, and they reluctantly admitted they could not build a dam at Mile Four. So, I tell you, my amendment challenges the good faith of the people of the upper basin to accept from the taxpayers of America the biggest gift ever given, and I feel certain that within a very short time you shall hear the representatives of the Upper Basin States stand up and tell you why they should not accept this gift.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. There is no doubt but that the gentleman's proposal would be a great saving to the Federal Government, but how does the gentleman expect that his proposal will be accepted by the Western States when, for instance, there is an implied agreement to come back to the Congress to appropriate something like $5 million more for the Arizona Central irrigation project? That is all a part of this agreement. Now how do you expect the gentleman from the West to accept your very modest proposal?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am only applying this to the upper basin States. We defeated the central Arizona project a couple of years ago. I feel that if this goes through, both gentlemen from Arizona should come forward and offer a new bill because if we are going to pass this bill, and if we are going to start this giveaway, then members of the Committee, we might as well give the whole thing away in the central Arizona project and the Frying Pan-Arkansas project.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is a very distinguished lawyer and a member of the Pennsylvania bar. I would like to ask the gentleman if he really believes that his amendment is constitutional?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that it is constitutional. If we can give money away to other nations, actually there is nothing in the Constitution that I know of that prevents the United States from giving to any four of the States of the Union amounts such as this.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman have any evidence, or does he really believe that Arizona has any ax to grind in this matter, or that this has anything really to do with the project in Arizona.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that Arizona has a lot to do with it. Arizona, in my opinion, has been negligent in its position in the past and I do not base that upon the gentleman's action, but from other people who have lived in that State.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that if the Government's claim for basic water rights for the Indians is upheld that the State of Arizona has more than a million acre feet estimated allotment to be given to Arizona under the basic Indian rights in addition to that which it already has under the pact?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So I would say to our friends from Arizona who beat their breasts and say, "We have nothing to gain from this contest," that they might be questioned on that point.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think they have a great deal to gain from this contest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

I suggest that this is the most disagreeable thing that has been presented before this body in connection with the debate on this bill. We do not ask for any handouts. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why some of the Members do not understand our desires and motives. They do not understand that we desire to pay our own way through our contribution to the Federal economy, the same as those other regions which have been developed.

The gentleman proposes that the Federal Government would give a grant of money which, compounded by the formula used by the gentleman from southern California, would amount to $20 or $30 billion in 100 years and in 200 years to the enormous sum of $48 billion. The West is not asking for that sort of Federal help in order to develop its contribution to the Federal economy.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman agree that the sole purpose of this amendment is to make this bill so bad that he hopes someone will vote it down?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Utah understands the author of this bill, he will know that the author would vote against the bill if the substitute of the gentleman from Pennsylvania were adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to correct one misapprehension. Several misapprehensions have been created here today. The 1 million acre-feet of water which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke about as coming to Arizona, of course he had reference to some possibility that might occur in a lawsuit of the State of Arizona versus the State of California. It was offered simply as a smokescreen. It has nothing to do with the merits of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course the gentleman knows that if the contention of Arizona is upheld it will affect the whole problem of the flow of the river, not only the water that will be impounded in the lower dam but the water that will be impounded in the upper dam, because that water will have to flow down to the Indians. It would have an effect on the compact. It would affect Arizona and all the other States involved.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman offered his previous bit of information as an effort to show there was some conspiracy between the States of the West. My only reason for taking the floor was to disabuse his mind of any possibility of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not use the word "conspiracy." I recognize the right of the gentleman from Arizona to press his contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I know that the proponents and sponsors of this bill to build the Colorado River storage project are colleagues of mine who are sincere in every way. Their purpose and their integrity are unquestioned. The distinguished gentlemen from Utah [Mr. DAWSON and Dr. DIXON] and the distinguished gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL and Mr. ROGERS] are estimable in every way. They are doing the thing they believe to be right in behalf of their own areas. I am sure that they are no less dedicated and high-minded than those who are opposed to this project.

Therefore, I trust that in these words which I am going to use, none of my colleagues will feel that I am transgressing the bounds of either friendship or legislative justification.

This House is now considering one of the most expensive but least economic water-resource projects ever acted on by any Congress. This is the proposed series of multipurpose dams and irrigation units in the upper Colorado River Basin, known as the Colorado River storage project.

The main concerted opposition to this project has come from two unrelated groups and for entirely different reasons. Water users in the lower Colorado River area, particularly those in California, oppose the project for fear it will cause a reduction in the Colorado River water supply available to them. Numerous conservation groups have voiced their opposition on the grounds that some construction would destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. A part of this opposition apparently has been relieved by the elimination of a certain portion of the entire construction.

These are good reasons, I assume, why those two groups should be vitally interested in the construction of this project.

However, it seems to me that there are good reasons why people broadly as a group should question the wisdom of the Federal Government embarking on this project. These reasons are economic and I believe get broadly at the question of whether or not this is a matter in the best interests of the entire country. From all the facts I have obtained, there is no other public-power project in the history of this country that will be so expensive per unit of power as the upper Colorado.

The cost of producing current will be 4½ times as much as that produced on the Columbia River, and 3 to 4 times as much as the current produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senate bill called for a total expenditure of $1,650,000,000. The House appropriation calls for roughly half that amount. However, even the proponents admit that the ultimate cost of this project must be approximately the outlay as set out by the Senate. It does not appear that this overall project can function without the various participating projects included in the Senate bill, but not included in the House bill. This merely means we are postponing the appropriation of approximately another $800 million until such time as the additional projects become absolutely necessary.

In reading the Senate report, I find that the entire cost of the municipal-power feature of the project, plus interest during the construction and payout period, will be returned to the Treasury. However, pursuant to reclamation law, no interest will be charged against irrigation costs. This interest will, of course, be a direct subsidy to the water users, paid for by the taxpayers. The cost of irrigation investment will be $305 million in the administration's proposed project. The Department of the Interior computed that the interest over the 60-year period would be $1,153,000,000.

This calculation is at 2½ percent compounded annually and assumes a final payoff of construction costs for irrigation in the year 2032. This amount is $335 million more than the construction cost of the entire project, including the hydroelectric and municipal water facilities as well as the irrigation, of course. If the upper Colorado project should be further expanded to include the 21 actually approved units as is contemplated in Senate 500, the construction costs of the irrigated units will be $908 million. The interest which the Government would have to pay on that amount would total at least $3,429,000,000 by the time the irrigated units are paid for by power revenues and water users.

From this you can see that the tremendous penalty is being paid for by the Federal Government in the form of interest in the ensuing 60 years.

EVENTUAL COST WILL PROBABLY BE MUCH HIGHER THAN NOW ESTIMATED

A report of a special subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee dated December 5, 1952, shows that the total cost of all Bureau of Reclamation projects, except the Missouri River Basin program, had increased 106 percent as of 1952 from the estimates originally submitted to Congress. The 1952 estimated cost of the Missouri Basin program had risen 274 percent from the figure used at the time it was approved by Congress. Similarly, the Department of the Interior figures show that 182 projects had increased in cost by 124 percent from the date they were originally considered by Congress.

Price changes accounted for about 30 percent of the increased cost of reclamation projects, while project modifications and other factors accounted for the balance.

POSSIBILITY OF PROJECT PAYING FOR ITSELF QUESTIONED

Suppose that the project can be built within the estimated cost, will this project pay for itself? If the power can be sold over the years at the relatively high cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar, it will take 78 years from the time construction is started to pay off all construction costs. This, of course, does not include interest.

The private electric companies in the upper Colorado River area have expressed a willingness to purchase power from the project to the extent that it is made available at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs. However, in their statement, these electric companies made a reservation that says the upper Colorado River Basin "is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world." Underground there are vast deposits of coal, great reservoirs of oil and natural gas, and mountains of oil shale and deposits of uranium ores.

The extent of these great resources for the production of thermal energy in the area is a sound reason in itself to question whether power from the upper Colorado project will be feasible some years hence when the development of these resources is increased.

DOES THE AGRICULTURE POTENTIAL WARRANT THE IRRIGATION EXPENSE?

The projects actually authorized in the Senate bill would provide water for 132,360 acres of new land and would supplement 250,330 acres of irrigated land for a total irrigated acreage of 382,690. The $378 million construction cost of the irrigation facilities indicates an average cost of $952 per acre. This, of course, is without interest. If the ultimate interest cost of $1,428 million on the irrigation investment is added to the construction cost, the average cost per acre becomes $2,142.

There are 12 authorized participating projects in the Colorado River storage project as passed in S. 500. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre for irrigated land in the 12 authorized projects be printed in the RECORD:

Project	New land irrigated (acres)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis
		Actual	New land equivalent					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. LaBarge	7,970			7,970	7,970	$1,673,300	$210	$210
2. Seedskadee	60,720			60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman		40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida	6,300	12,650	4,217	18,950	10,517	6,503,600	343	618
8. Pine River project extension	15,150			15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond	3,670			3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry		16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. Chairman, this is the cost without adding any interest. The interest cost which will be borne by the Federal Government should be added to the cost of principal. I am applying the ratio of 1.25 for interest in order to be as fair as possible to the sponsors of this project. The construction cost is estimated for 10 years. The period of no interest is 10, plus 10, plus 50—or 70 years. If the interest is added, the cost of the irrigation of the authorized participating projects is as follows:

For the LaBarge project, $472 an acre.

For the Seedskadee project, $861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, $1,755 an acre.

For the Silt project, $1,995 an acre.

For the Smith Fork project, $1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, $2,135 an acre.

For the Florida project, $1,490 an acre.

For the Pine River project extension, $747 an acre.

For the Emery County project, $2,074 an acre.

For the Central Utah project, $3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, $1,411 an acre.

For the Gooseberry project, $2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is $2,142 an acre.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to insert a table showing the cost per acre of the irrigated land projects, including interest, in these 12 projects. I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

La Barge	$210	× $1.25 =	$262.50 +	$210 = $472.50
Seedskadee	383	× 1.25 =	478.75 +	383 = 861.75
Lyman	780	× 1.25 =	975.00 +	780 = 1,755.00
Silt	887	× 1.25 =	1,108.75 +	887 = 1,995.75
Smith Fork	670	× 1.25 =	837.50 +	670 = 1,507.50
Paonia	949	× 1.25 =	1,186.25 +	949 = 2,135.25
Florida	618	× 1.25 =	872.50 +	618 = 1,490.50
Pine River project extension	332	× 1.25 =	415.00 +	332 = 747.00
Emery County	922	× 1.25 =	1,152.50 +	922 = 2,074.50
Central Utah	1,757	× 1.25 =	2,196.25 +	1,757 = 3,953.25
Hammond	627	× 1.25 =	783.75 +	627 = 1,410.75
Gooseberry	1,047	× 1.25 =	1,308.75 +	1,047 = 2,355.75
Total	952	× 1.25 =	1,190.00 +	952 = 2,142.00

I come from the State of Illinois. This is a rich agricultural area—especially through the middle portion of the State. Some of it is the most fertile land in the world. I have not heard of any land selling for more than $700 per acre.

The national average value per acre for farm land, including farm buildings, was $78.81 in March 1955, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. The Department statistics also show that about 20 million acres of presently unused lands east of the Rocky Mountain Plateau area can be reclaimed for a fraction of what it would cost per acre in the upper Colorado River basin.

I believe that all of the proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than 1 mile. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. The winters there are long and cold and the growing season is quite short.

Based upon the above estimates the cost of this project to the people of the State of Illinois would be $261,975,600. This would, of course, include cost of construction and interest. This would represent a cost of about $170 per family to the people of the State of Illinois. A further breakdown indicates that the cost for each 150-acre farm irrigated through this project would be about $321,300.

Mr. Chairman, I herewith insert a table showing the cost to the individual States in the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated			Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation			Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700	New Hampshire	0.27	$2,951,100	$3,855,600	$4,457,700	$9,258,300
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900	New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200	New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,000	152,222,200	316,153,800	New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200	North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000	Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300	Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000	Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400	Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600	Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500	South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900	South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300	Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900	Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100	Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200	Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500	Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700	Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200	West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200	Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400	Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200	District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900						
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700						
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400	Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

You will note that in all my figures I am using the cost as allocated and set up in S. 500 rather than in the House bill. I have not found anyone yet who consistently states to me that the House project as set up will be feasible. In my opinion, if the Colorado River storage project is to be feasible and workable, it will be necessary to have the connecting projects set out in the Senate bill. This merely means we will be making supplemental appropriations for these projects until such time as the total cost reaches that set out in S. 500.

May I say to my colleagues, it is true small portions of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming will benefit from the passage of this bill. These areas would receive 100 percent of the benefits of the proposed project. However, the four States combined would pay less than 2 percent of the added national tax burden. The taxpayers of the other 44 States would have to pay the balance, but would derive no benefits from the project itself.

The House bill which is being heard at this time will call for an expenditure of approximately one-half the amount which passed the Senate last year. However, it does not seem that any disguise of a smaller appropriation could make the project more palatable than the one passed by the Senate. This reduction alone will not transform the true character, nor revise the present cost aspects of the upper Colorado River storage project.

IS THIS PROJECT IN KEEPING WITH GOOD PUBLIC POLICY?

The policy set out by this bill appears to me to be one almost directly opposite to the present public policy of the Department of Agriculture insofar as production acres are concerned. When this irrigation project is completed there will be added approximately 400,000 acres to the productive capacity of the agricultural plant of the United States. A few days ago, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture seeking approval of a far-reaching plan to remove somewhere between 20 and 40 million acres from the productive capacity of our agricultural plant. It is an impossibility for me to describe the opposite directions in which apparently we are going by such a plan as is proposed in the Colorado River storage project on irrigated productive acres.

In addition, how can we justify to the general public the additional acreage provided in this project at such enormous cost per acre as $2,355 an acre for the Gooseberry project, $3,593 an acre for the central Utah project, and a grand average for the 12 projects of $2,142 an acre? I realize that in many instances the Congress is forced to do things of which some people back home would not approve—all in the best interests of the entire country. However, I am asking at this time, if your people back home could have heard all of the debate thus far on this project, both for and against, how many votes do you think this project would receive from the people in your district? I believe I am conservative in saying that if all of the information were available to the general public that has been made available to me in this debate, this project would not receive the approval of 5 out of 100 people in the 22d Congressional District of Illinois. In talking with many other Congressmen, I believe their reaction has been almost the same as mine as to how people generally would feel about this project.

For the reasons which I have outlined, it appears to me that this project is not broadly in the interest of the United States, and for that reason it should not be enacted into law.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman suppose the same thing would be true as to flood-control projects in Ohio in my district?

Is it not occasionally better for some of us to perhaps vote for what we consider the need of the whole country rather than that of some people in our district?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. I think that is a fair statement of the gentleman from Utah. I will say that you gentlemen are worthy and your integrity is not in question. You stand for what you think is right. So do I. In this particular instance I do not believe this project is in the best interest of all of the country. That is just my own opinion based on the benefits to be received on the amount of money that is to be spent.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does not the gentleman feel that the President of the United States is in a very good position to know the overall picture of this? Does not the gentleman give some credit to the President's opinion as expressed in his endorsement of yesterday?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. It is a difficult thing to find myself at variance with my leader. I hate to have to disagree with him, on this project. I believe I have disagreed with him on three major issues in 3 years. I do disagree with him on this. I could not in good conscience support this project.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And is not the administration sponsoring a soil-fertility bank at the same time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but I do not know what connection that has with this.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman himself just mentioned that we were putting land into production.

Mr. SPRINGER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to the committee amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending substitute amendment and all amendments thereto end in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California advise me if that will give me at least 3 minutes?

Mr. ENGLE. I included the gentleman in my computation of time.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. I had included the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I will amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes following the time allotted to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I said in the opening days of this debate that the proponents of this legislation would show:

First. That it has bipartisan support. I am sure all of my colleagues recognize that this is now true. Incidently, it also has bipartisan opposition. That opposition in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was 20 to 5. The proponents carried the bill in the other body by a vote of almost 2 to 1.

Second. I promised to show the project had engineering feasibility. The opponents are attacking the feasibility and the capability of the engineers. The same engineers and department planned the Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams. They planned the great Imperial Irrigation District. Years of exhaustive work has shown the project to be feasible. The Chinle's rocks hoax has proven to be a Barnum & Bailey believe-it-or-not show. The Chinle's rock is 700 feet below the base of the dam. My colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] demonstrated to you that the Chinle's rock as it appears in nature is no obstacle to the building of this dam. It does not dissolve in water as easily as opponents would want you to believe.

Third. I promised to show that it was economically feasible. More than two-thirds of the project repays all the money, with interest. There is a very small amount of flood control, all nonreimbursable funds. Economists have proven feasibility.

Fourth. We have shown that the so-called tax map has been a phoney. That the Tax Foundation of New York and Washington denied having anything to do with it. It was prepared by the Colorado River Association, with which the Tax Foundation has no connection. The foundation did not prepare these figures, which were prepared and published without their consent.

Fifth. Now as to surplus crops the committee will accept an amendment which handles those who worry about surplus crops. In fact very little surplus crops come from federally irrigated land.

Sixth. We have shown that the Indians will receive some direct help because it provides labor, it provides better economy.

Seventh. We have shown that the project will not cost from $4 to $8 billion as proclaimed by the opponents, but less than $800 million as indicated in this bill.

Eighth. We have shown that it does not irrigate 583,000 acres as the southern California lobby would make you believe, but approximately 132,000 acres of new land.

We have tried to show, my colleagues, that the Colorado River storage project is a well planned, economically sound water development project for a semi-desert portion of the country which needs water for various purposes. The project has been planned to reimburse through revenue from water and power which will be used and paid for by the residents of that area. Two-thirds of it at full interest and to meet the cost of operation and maintenance.

I am sure any objective legislator will recognize that the southern California water lobby stands to profit by millions of dollars if they succeed in defeating and delaying the developing of the four upper basin States water and power that was allocated to them in a solemn interstate compact effected nearly 25 years ago.

Ninth. We have shown that California will not lose one bucketful of water. In fact, it seems to me that by storing the water in these reservoirs, that the Southern States would be more assured of a water supply because the dams would hold back excess water that now runs to the Gulf of California, without being stored or used. With the water properly stored, it would assure the Southern States of the amount of water promised to them under the basin compact.

I trust, my colleagues, you will not be looking just at the effects of this project as of today, but thinking in terms of two hundred to three hundred million people who will be living in this country by the time this project is completed. They will need homes, jobs; and they will need food.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for conducting what I consider to be some of the most impartial hearings I have ever had the privilege of sitting in on. As a matter of fact, he gave the opposition equal time on every occasion. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the chairman of the subcommittee have been fair in every respect and certainly have the respect and high regard of every member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and his committee have sold me on this bill. When this debate started I was inclined against it. Now I am supporting it.

I have been studying the voluminous material for and against this bill that has been pouring into my office. The statements of basic facts as to costs, feasibility, and so forth, have varied so widely that I have wondered whether the proponents and opponents were talking about the same project.

It turns out that this is no $4 billion project, but authorizes $760 million for a comprehensive plan for storing water for the upper basin of the Colorado River that will take many years to complete and will be 99 percent reimbursable as to principal and interest, except for the irrigation expenditure where principal alone is repayable, according to reclamation principles established since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt. Over half of the area of the four States is federally owned. The reclamation fund, during the 19 years of completion of the irrigation project, will take in from these 4 States in mineral royalties, sales, and leases, $150 million more than the $287 million to be spent on irrigation. Water is gold for these four States in the upper Colorado Basin. The lower States, especially California, have gotten their share of Colorado River water

through Hoover Dam and the other great Federal works. Under the seven-State compact, which is basic to this bill, the upper-basin States should now have a chance to store and use their share of the water.

In addition to electric power and municipal water use, irrigation will ultimately reclaim about 131,000 acres. We do not need these acres now, when we are talking of a soil bank. They will not be reclaimed now. They will be reclaimed over a period of 19 years or more. By that time our growing population will need those acres. By the amendment we adopted they cannot be used for raising crops in surplus for 10 years. By that time we will probably need whatever they can produce.

The more I learn of the possibilities of this project the more I appreciate why three Presidents and their administrations have backed it, why it is a part of President Eisenhower's program that he has urged in the last few days.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, in speaking in opposition to the substitute I want to point out that until the substitute was offered all of the revenues went into a basin fund out of which all of the expenses were paid. I want you to be sure you understand the substitute changes that situation; that all of the revenues go into a fund, the amount of moneys in the fund are split up in accordance with the allocation of water between these States, which makes a considerable difference in the ability of the projects to pay back because some of the authorized projects are not in monetary proportion to the allocation of water. Based on that, even assuming you could sell power for 6 mills for the next hundred years, I have here a calculation which shows that the deficit for Utah would amount to $82 million for the hundred years, for Wyoming the sum of $13 million, although there would be surpluses for Colorado and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation has concluded: First, that a basin fund could be established providing Utah projects—including central Utah project—the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent; and, second, credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383, in fact only one-third of those credits will be required to complete the repayment of all such projects. A purported detailed analysis in support of these conclusions was brought to light for the first time during debate on Tuesday.

It is my firm belief that these conclusions by the Bureau will never be proved in practice.

First. They are based on selling power at 6 mills until the year 2052 A. D., 96 years from now. I have explained elsewhere why this is an impossible assumption.

Second. Independent engineering studies by competent engineers in whom I have a great deal of confidence, based upon Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as submitted and of record in hearings on this legislation show quite to the contrary.

These studies show that under the repayment provisions and allocation of basin funds to the States as proposed in H. R. 3383, as amended:

First. The total excess revenues in the basin fund available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance over the 50-year repayment period prescribed would be $130 million.

Second. The total irrigation assistance needed for participating projects proposed for authorization would be over $170 million, indicating an overall deficit of $40 million.

Third. Colorado and New Mexico would be the only States that would have a surplus of credited basin funds under the allocation formula contained in the committee amendment.

Fourth. Utah with 21.5 percent allocation of basin funds, after allowance for additional credit of net power revenues derived from central Utah project, would have a deficit of $82 million in meeting the required 50-year repayment on projects in that State.

Fifth. If all 34 participating projects named in the bill were authorized, net revenues in the basin fund in a 50-year period would be deficient by over $400 million in meeting the irrigation assistance required and would likewise be deficient in each of the States under the proposed percentage allocation.

Sixth. Even assuming Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as set forth in an unpublished special study dated December 6, 1955—which were materially altered from those previously submitted and of record in the hearings, particularly in increasing power revenue estimates—the independent studies show (a) that the irrigation assistance available from the basin fund to Utah under the 21.5 percent allocation proposed and from central Utah project revenues would be only about three-fourths of the amount required for Utah projects authorized in the bill and (b) that there would be a deficit in each of the four States if all 34 projects named in H. R. 3383 were authorized, with an overall deficit of $167 million.

These independent studies demonstrate that the repayment provisions of H. R. 3383 as amended are unsound and unworkable and would not provide repayment as claimed. Furthermore, the companion provision in the bill for 100 year repayment of the power investment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

Even if the original construction cost of the overall project were to be repaid over a 100-year period, which is very doubtful to say the least, the hidden Federal subsidy that would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers in accumulated interest charges on the funds advanced for construction would be at least $4 billion. Such a Federal subsidy cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination.

These computations and conclusions are based upon the estimates of total power investment and net power revenues contained in the trial studies of the USBR dated December 6, 1955. Those trial studies pertain to the Senate bill, S. 500, but with the apparent modification of assuming in place of the 940,000 acre-foot Curecanti Reservoir with single powerplant, a substitute comprising not only that powerplant but three other downstream powerplants. Apparently the power investment and revenues in the December 6 trial studies were estimated on the basis of such modification.

The computations upon which I rely were based upon the estimates of total power investment and net annual power revenues heretofore used in studies by the Colorado River Board of California, a State agency. The figures apply to a project which would include the single Curecanti Reservoir of 940,000 acre-feet and the single powerplant of that unit.

The following is a breakdown of these calculations to obtain estimate net revenues from the basin fund of $130 million available for irrigation assistance:

Irrigation assistance available to upper basin States under new version of H. R. 3383, amended by committee, Feb. 8, 1956

Power investment, including interest during construction: Glen Canyon Flaming Gorge Curecanti, and Central Utah	$582,421,000
Net annual power revenues (4 units) after 8th year	$20,500,000
If all net power revenues were applied to power investment, it would be paid in years	50
If interest on power investment only was paid during irrigation repayment period, and final power payment was made in year 100, net power revenues could be applied to irrigation repayment for years	50
Net power revenues above O. M. and R. for first 50 years	$913,760,000
Simple interest on power investment for 50 years at 2½ percent	$651,360,000
Available for irrigation repayment	$262,400,000
Irrigation allocations of 4 storage units [1]	124,590,000
Available for repayment of participating projects	137,810,000
Central Utah power revenues available for CVP irrigation allocation in 50 years ($71,400,000 revenues, $62,965,000 interest) [2]	8,435,000
"Excess" revenues available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance	$129,375,000

[1] Glen Canyon, Curecanti (single dam), Flaming Gorge, Navaho. Data from House hearings on H. R. 3383 and H. Rept. No. 1087.

[2] Assuming total investment applicable for 46 years, arbitrarily.

Say $130 million.

The following is a breakdown showing how and wherein under the provision

of the committee's substitute, these revenues would be inadequate to pay for projects in Utah and Wyoming, the deficit being the total sum of $32,489,900:

Comparison of irrigation assistance needed with that available under new version of H. R. 3383 (100-year payout)

[Dollar units]

Item	Colorado	Utah	Wyoming	New Mexico	Total
1. Percentage allotment of excess revenues	46.0	21.5	15.5	17.0	100.0
2. Irrigation assistance from excess revenues	59,800,000	28,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	130,000,000
3. Additional irrigation assistance	0	[1] 8,000,000	0	0	8,000,000
4. Total irrigation assistance available	59,800,000	36,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	138,000,000
5. Total irrigation assistance needed	256,039,600	121,437,000	64,128,000	97,592,100	539,196,700
6. Irrigation assistance needed for H. R. 3383 projects	16,586,900	118,084,500	33,761,300	2,057,200	170,489,900
7. Ratio of total need to total available (5÷4)	4.28	3.37	3.19	4.42	3.91
8. Ratio of H. R. 3383 need to total available (6÷4)	0.277	3.28	1.68	0.093	1.24
9. Excess assistance for H. R. 3383 projects (4—6)	43,213,100	—82,084,500	—13,661,300	20,042,800	—32,489,900
10. Deficiency of assistance for projects listed by USBR in trial studies of Dec. 6, 1955 (5—4)	196,239,600	85,437,000	44,028,000	75,492,100	401,196,700

[1] From Central Utah project power revenues.

Mr. HILLINGS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3383. There have been many good reasons expressed here today why the upper Colorado bill is unsound and should not be passed. I wish to add my voice to this opposition and point out one particular phase of the legislation which is a good example of the bill's general unsoundness.

The legislation contains a provision for a project for the benefit of Navaho Indians in New Mexico. Whenever any aid is proposed for the Navahos, it is always greeted with rejoicing because of the poor conditions under which they live.

The bill we are debating would provide irrigated farms for some 1,100 Navaho Indian families at a cost per farm of $200,000 according to witnesses from the Bureau of Indian Affairs who testified on the subject. These witnesses stated that the gross income per family farm would be about $5,000 a year. It is easy to see that the interest charges alone on this invetsment of $200,000 per farm would, at 2½ percent, equal the gross farm income. It seems to me that less expensive methods could be found to provide for these Indians. We constantly urge that it is not in the best interest of Indians to hold them in a second class citizenship status but in this bill we are providing a Government dole of $200,000 per farm for which all Americans will have to pay. Testimony at the committee hearings was also adduced to the effect that there is grave doubt as to whether the Indians want to farm irrigated land or whether they could succeed as farmers of such irrigated land.

I urge all present to defeat this extravagant legislation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a fundamental question. It is a question whether we can in all good conscience pour out the taxpayers' money entrusted to us for a proposition that has never become clear.

I include in the RECORD a quotation from Raymond Moley's Case Against Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects:

A TRUE PARTNERSHIP

There is a strange claim by some proponents of the Colorado River storage project that they are supporting a partnership plan such as has been advanced as an administration policy in the Northwest. There is no resemblance at all. The party of the first part, the Federal Government, is paying for the entire project and is constructing it. The parties of the second part supply the arid land. I favor, with the President's Cabinet Committee and with the earlier report of the Hoover Commission, a true sharing of the responsibilities in this project.

I have never contended and do not contend now that the four States in the upper basin are not entitled to the share of the water of the Colorado and its tributaries which was specified in the Colorado River Compact. Nor do I deny that the Federal Government should build the means to store that water when needed. For the Federal Government by long prescription has assumed the responsibility of regulating the flow of interstate rivers. But this does not mean that the Government should build huge storage dams unless and until needed for water conservation and regulation.

Beyond that, I do not believe the Federal Government has an obligation. The power companies of the region which offered their testimony to the effect that there was a market—at a price—for the power should finance the power aspects of the storage dams themselves and dispose of the power where such storage dams can be justified. That is exactly what the Eisenhower-McKay partnership policy means, as illustrated by the proposed John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

Moreover, those cities which are in need of water for domestic purposes should provide the means of getting the water from the storage reservoirs. Finally, those industrial companies which are in the area and which are now so eagerly seeking subsidized water, should provide the means of getting the water for themselves. In short, the Federal Government should provide storage for the water as needed, and the users should go and get it. This would be true of the irrigators who are in need of supplementary supplies and those people—unnamed—who are anxious to try their fortunes on new irrigated land. This could be done through the States concerned if—and this if it is very large indeed—the bestowal of water will indeed produce the wealth which proponents of this project claim. So far as the Navaho Indians are concerned, surely a Government which has been engaged for a century or more in caring for and regulating the life of these natives can provide a less expensive way to make them self-reliant than to set them up on farms at a cost to the taxpayer of $200,000 a family.

THE ISSUE IN MORALS AND EQUITY

If the issue were a simple matter of taking from rich States and giving to poor States, there might be a case despite the financial, engineering, and economic factors which I have mentioned. But these are not needy States. Their potential wealth is considerable, and their well-being is reflected in all that they pay for the benefit of the outside world. On the basis of per-capita income, they rank with the average among the States.

There is, moreover, a final consideration. It can be shown that the propaganda of the Federal Government for reclamation has in innumerable cases imposed a cruel hoax upon the farmers who attempt to cultivate the land. Indeed, the progressive lengthening of the payment period from 10 years in 1902 to 20 years in 1914 to 40 years in 1926 to 50 years in 1939 has been in response to the cries of distress of the unfortunate farmers and their congressional representatives. Since I have been writing about this subject over the past 2 years, I have received pathetic letters from farmers whose state of affairs has progressively turned to the worse. Despite the immense amount per acre that it takes to put water on arid land, the cultivation of that land and the management of the irrigation itself is a heavy burden upon the farmer. It is time to play fair with these farmers, as well as with the taxpayers of the 44 States in whose interest this discussion of the Colorado River storage project has been written.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has had a very fine debate in the last several days and quite in conformity with the historic traditions of the House. We have been debating a problem that is not new to America. There is nothing new or revolutionary about what is proposed here today.

Conservation of water, reclamation, and irrigation are all topics that have been before the American people constantly since they were strenuously advocated by Theodore Roosevelt. We have a right as a nation to conserve the water of our country; we have a right to protect the people of the country from water shortages and from damages through water. These are related functions of the Federal Government. A nation without vision perishes. We must have vision if we are going to go forward to the destiny which I believe will be that of the American Republic. This projects the vision of a people who are planning for a better future.

Now let us look at the bill that we have before us today, a bill that I believe is going to be an important factor in the upbuilding of 4 or 5 of the great States of the Union. And, may I say here that merely relying on the opposition to a proposal by a single State is not

well founded. The common good must come first. We are all citizens of this one country; we are all part of the United States of America. No part of the country can be benefited without all the rest of the country sharing in the benefits. We are all here together in America; we go up together or we will go down together. Let us plan to go up together.

This particular measure has had a great deal of opposition in the past. I want to repeat that there is no Echo Park Dam in this legislation. That legislation has been removed, and we have the promise of the managers on the part of the House they will not permit it to be reinserted. And certainly those of us who are here have the power of veto if for any reason it should be reinserted. I mean by that, to vote down that conference report when it comes here, and I am confident that would be the verdict. Therefore, we need not fear that Echo Dam will be inserted in the conference report.

The cost of this project is small when you consider the tremendous value that will come out of it. Only 1 percent of the building cost is nonreimbursable. There is no interest in the reclamation part of the bill, as is the case in all reclamation projects. There is no heavy drain upon a country. Most of the expenditure will eventually come back to the Treasury, and we will have reclaimed a great national asset.

And let me comment right here and say to those who fear the further accentuation of the problem of surpluses that this will not happen. We have written into this bill an amendment which says that no new land may be brought into cultivation within 10 years, and there are those who believe that in the normal course of events it will take at least 20 years before new land can come into cultivation. This eliminates any immediate effect upon surpluses. My friends, may I say that while we are troubled with surpluses now our country is going forward in the future with such tremendous leaps and bounds in population the time may well come when we will want more land in cultivation so that we can feed the population who dwell in the great cities. This could be farsighted planning without any immediate harm.

One word more. This is an integral part of the program of President Eisenhower. It is part of the program that is dear to his heart, a part of the essential program that he seeks for the American people. In conclusion, let us not forget that in passing this resolution we enact legislation that will be of tremendous benefit to the four States who need a little shot in the arm from the Government so that they can face the future with hope and anticipation. You hear some talk about the workingman not sharing in this investment. Why, my friends, the money that will go for the purchase of machinery, tools, and equipment is not confined to any one State of the Union. All 48 States will in some way benefit by this program. I repeat, we all benefit by the starting of this great conservation program.

To my Republican friends I want to particularly ask that you support the President of the United States. He has given a program to the American people. This is part of his program, and we should give him a fair chance to fulfill his desire. Let us give these Mountain States a chance to live, and let us uphold the proposal of the President of the United States.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of 1 of the 44 States not receiving any direct benefit from the upper Colorado River project, I want to take this opportunity to explain my vote in support of this legislation which I deem of vital importance to all America.

Although I have been elected from 1 of 23 congressional districts in Ohio, I do not believe I was sent to Washington to support projects and legislation which would be of tangible value and usefulness only to the people of my district. While the immediate needs of the people of my district are vitally important, I know that they would be anxious to support national projects which are vitally important to the Nation as a whole. The people of my community know full well that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway improvements are of direct benefit only to those States which abut the Great Lakes, and that tremendous sums of money have been appropriated over the years by Congress for the improvement of the Great Lakes Seaway system. This legislation of necessity was supported by communities remote and distant from any direct advantage.

I support the Colorado River storage project because it is an important national improvement. The legislation as now designed eliminates any damage or interference with our national park system. The improvement will open a large four-State area for agriculture, comfortable habitation, and more efficient mining and industry. True, some industry and some people may be lured from Ohio and perhaps the community which I represent to make their homes in this newly developed area, but this area is just as much America as the precincts which I represent. Water, power, and a wholly changed landscape in the four affected States will enrich and improve the American productive plant. To complain about the threat this new productive area will become to other producing areas of agricultural or industrial products would be a narrow, provincial and an un-American viewpoint.

Although it is true that the new land to be developed by the project would be high-altitude land and therefore of limited agricultural value, it would nevertheless be usable land, producing grains and forage crops. Today, in view of our agricultural surplus and the proposal to retire excessive lands in a land bank, there is considerable criticism of developing new agricultural land when the country abounds in agricultural surpluses. It is my opinion that the current agricultural surpluses are a temporary condition which could radically change, particularly in view of the drastic increase in our population and the tremendous migration of people from rural areas to urban centers.

To create an abundance of agricultural products is to be provident. To create an abundance of agricultural land in a growing Nation is to be provident. If we should risk error, it seems to me that the risk should be made on the side of providence rather than improvidence. There is a greater security in an economy of abundance than any other I know about.

Personally, I believe fresh water to be America's most prized natural resource. In this bountiful land, I believe it not only wasteful but almost sinful to permit lifegiving fresh water to evaporate on the sands of the desert or find its way to the sea. In our times we may yet see projects to accumulate, save, and distribute the tremendous fresh waters of our Great Lakes for agricultural as well as industrial production. With a proper distribution of the fresh water reserves of America, the whole face of the continent may be changed and with it the entire climate of the Nation might be affected. With the tremendous contemplated increase in human life, there must naturally be an increase in animal and vegetable life. Almost as important, there must be a comparable development of habitable space. While our people are becoming more and more urban, they have not lost their respect for open space and the average family has manifested its desire for the convenience and the comfort of urban living on a 2-acre parcel. The newly developed lands of the Colorado Basin in this project will provide space in which more Americans may have comfortable living. This new space will contribute in a great measure to lessening the pressures in our cities and urban communities. America is vast but its people have spread to all of its boundaries. The pressure of growing populations on habitable soil is increasing throughout the world. Under our democratic system and in view of the principles in which we believe, we cannot spread our people into the lands of other nations. Our only alternative in the democratic way is to make America larger by developing the land within our own boundaries.

The cost of this project is great and certainly is more costly than numerous other reclamation projects which have preceded it. It is in the recognition of this point that earlier reclamation projects have preceded this one. It is national experience that the cost of these improvement projects goes ever upward. If therefore this Colorado River project is for the good of all America, it is in the interest of economy that we undertake it at the earliest practicable date rather than defer it to a higher-cost period.

So therefore, when I support this great and important project with my vote today, I do so not only for the people who live in my district today but for their successors who may be dependent upon the resources of this great area for their national defense, for minerals, for agricultural products or perhaps for open living space. I cast this vote looking ahead for those who must follow us on this shrinking land on which we live. I support this important project not only for the food that this new land can provide or its minerals or the products of the industry that may develop, but also for the space land which people will require in comfortable modern life.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentlemen on this committee and those in charge of this bill, especially the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for their careful study of this measure. These two men have been fair, patient, honest, and very considerate in all of the hearings, not only on this important matter but all others.

These gentlemen and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and other members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee assisted us in securing passage of the Washita Basin Improvement Association project. We Oklahoma Members desiring to be helpful in this instance, have enlisted the support of several other Members for this Colorado project in appreciation of the favors extended us.

We urge a favorable vote on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 311, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. GROSS. 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. The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and seventy-two Members are present; not a quorum.

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 256, nays 136, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS 256

Adair	Fisher	Morrison
Addonizio	Fjare	Moss
Albert	Flood	Moulder
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Forand	Natcher
Andrews	Ford	Nicholson
Arends	Forrester	Norblad
Aspinall	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Avery	Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.
Ayres	George	O'Neill
Baker	Gordon	Ostertag
Baldwin	Grant	Passman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patman
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Patterson
Bates	Gubser	Pelly
Beamer	Halleck	Perkins
Becker	Harris	Pfost
Belcher	Harvey	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Pilcher
Bentley	Hayworth	Powell
Berry	Healey	Price
Blatnik	Hébert	Quigley
Boggs	Heselton	Radwan
Boland	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Bolling	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Holland	Reuss
Brooks, La.	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Richards
Broyhill	Horan	Riehlman
Buckley	Hyde	Rivers
Burdick	Ikard	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Rodino
Canfield	Jensen	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Carnahan	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Celler	Judd	Rutherford
Chenoweth	Karsten	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Kearney	St. George
Christopher	Kearns	Schwengel
Chudoff	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Scudder
Cole	Keogh	Seely-Brown
Coon	Kilburn	Selden
Cooper	Kilday	Sheehan
Coudert	Kilgore	Shelley
Cramer	Kirwan	Short
Cretella	Krueger	Sieminski
Crumpacker	Landrum	Siler
Cunningham	Lane	Sisk
Curtis, Mass.	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Lankford	Smith, Kans.
Davidson	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Steed
Dawson, Utah	Long	Sullivan
Deane	Lovre	Talle
Delaney	McCarthy	Taylor
Dempsey	McConnell	Thomas
Diggs	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Dingell	McGregor	Thompson, N. J.
Dixon	Macdonald	Thomson, Wyo.
Dodd	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Dollinger	Mack, Wash.	Trimble
Dolliver	Magnuson	Tumulty
Dondero	Marshall	Udall
Donohue	Martin	Vanik
Dorn, S. C.	Meader	Velde
Edmondson	Merrow	Vinson
Elliott	Metcalf	Vorys
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Vursell
Engle	Miller, Md.	Wainwright
Evins	Miller, Nebr.	Walter
Feighan	Miller, N. Y.	Weaver
Fernandez	Mills	Westland
	Minshall	Wickersham
	Morano	Widnall
	Morgan	Wier
	Wigglesworth	Wolcott
	Williams, N. J.	Wolverton
	Williams, N. Y.	Wright
	Willis	Yates
	Withrow	Young
		Younger
		Zablocki
		Zelenko

NAYS 136

Abbitt	Flynt	McVey
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.
Alexander	Friedel	Madden
Alger	Garmatz	Mahon
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Mailliard
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Mason
Ashley	Gentry	Matthews
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Mumma
Barden	Gross	Murray, Ill.
Bass, N. H.	Gwinn	Norrell
Baumhart	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	O'Konski
Betts	Haley	Osmers
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hand	Phillips
Bonner	Harden	Pillion
Bow	Hardy	Poage
Boyle	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Bray	Harrison, Va.	Polk
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Prouty
Brownson	Herlong	Rabaut
Budge	Hess	Ray
Burleson	Hiestand	Riley
Bush	Hinshaw	Robeson,
Carlyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Carrigg	Holifield	Roosevelt
Chase	Holt	Saylor
Chelf	Hosmer	Schenck
Church	Huddleston	Scherer
Clevenger	Hull	Sheppard
Colmer	Jackson	Shuford
Cooley	James	Sikes
Corbett	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Spence
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Devereux	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Dies	Kean	Teague, Calif.
Dorn, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Thompson, Mich.
Doyle	Knox	Utt
Durham	Laird	Van Zandt
Fallon	Lipscomb	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	McCulloch	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	McDonough	Wilson, Ind.
Fino	McIntire	Winstead
	McMillan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1

Van Pelt

NOT VOTING 40

Anfuso	Gamble	Nelson
Bailey	Granahan	Preston
Bell	Gray	Priest
Blitch	Gregory	Rains
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Scrivner
Boykin	Hillings	Staggers
Burnside	Kee	Thompson, Tex.
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Chatham	King, Pa.	Tuck
Denton	Klein	Watts
Derounian	Knutson	Wharton
Donovan	McDowell	Whitten
Eberharter	Mollohan	
Fountain	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bell for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Burnside against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mrs. Knutson against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. King of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Gable.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DEROUNIAN. Were he present, he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BUDGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

The House should not be expected to rewrite this bill on the floor of this Chamber. At the very least, the bill should be recommitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study and hearings upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects of the bill have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic, and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. These unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in the upper Colorado River storage project bill should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project has never been subjected to such a necessary thorough review.

The haste and pressure under which this whole project has been presented to the Congress has already resulted in a strange piece of legislative history. Some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on February 8, 1956, considered and approved amendments to this bill. A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original bill, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil-bank proposal now before the Congress would require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses, while H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops—some of which may well be placed in soil-bank reserve—to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

The upper Colorado River storage project is ill planned in part, and in other parts not planned at all.

I believe that one of the most serious faults of both the House and Senate bills is that projects are authorized subject to the submission of feasibility reports by the Secretary of the Interior and further action by Congress. This sort of legislation, while it has been done before as the result of legislative logrolling, is plainly a perversion. If a project is only vaguely justified and needs study and report by the Interior Department, why should it be named at all in a bill? The naming of additional irrigation projects and storage units in these bills establishes a moral commitment to the States and communities which believe that they would be benefited by these projects, and would make further and final action by the Department and Congress more or less a formality. These bills are and are not authorizations. They contain several different kinds of qualified authorizations. They are intended to mean whatever the interested groups happen to want them to mean at a given moment. Specifically, they are intended to tell the people in the beneficiary States that they are to have practically every "participating project" their hearts desire, while at the same time telling the anxious taxpayers in the other 44 States of the Union that the project is to cost only about a billion dollars. There can be no integrity in such legislation.

The upper Colorado project is not self-liquidating, as its proponents claim. The main cash box from which the alleged restoration to the Treasury of the money expended is to come, is the revenue from the power aspects of the project, but the bill absurdly overestimates the capacity of the power units to bear the financial load assigned to them. The upper Colorado Basin has a boundless supply of energy potential in coal, natural gas, oil shale, and uranium which are rapidly making hydroelectric power uneconomical in this area. What could be more obvious than the absurdity of any plan which must depend for its repayment not only upon the useful life of hydroelectric installations up to 100 years, but upon prices for power based upon present conditions when the power companies buying the power generated have expressly qualified their purchase commitments to purchase power only at prices comparable to the cost of power from other sources.

The project would involve an excessive and incredible cost per acre benefited. Not one single irrigation project in all of the participating projects is financially sound. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are threatened by this project. The benefit-cost ratio concept of project justification has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. It has been demonstrated that the lands to be serviced by the irrigation components of the project, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, would be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop these lands would average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, while, at the same time, there exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a small fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project. Completely aside from the fact that the benefit-cost ratio has highly dubious legal standing as a mechanism for justification of projects, proposed expenditures for such obviously negligible returns are an absurd fraud on the American taxpayers whether the groups favoring this project talk vaguely about "indirect benefits" or "public benefits" or "social benefits."

In order to manufacture a case for financial and economic feasibility, the bills embody dubious exercises in bookkeeping. One of the bookkeeping devices embodied in this plan would be a "basin account," a fund into which all revenues would be poured for use in financing additional projects whenever possible. This "basin account" scheme has never been specifically approved by Congress in an authorizing statute. This "basin account" scheme has been made necessary in the upper Colorado project because the storage units of power producing facilities would not directly serve irrigation or other water-use projects with water directly. The irrigation projects cannot pay for themselves, so some connection between such power projects as Glen Canyon and the irrigation projects had to be made in order that it could be alleged that power revenues would

pay for irrigation. Since there was little or no functional or geographic connection, the connection was made by drafting a unique statutory proposal which created a financial bond between these otherwise unrelated portions of the project. The connection between such dams as Glen Canyon and irrigation in the upper Colorado project is exclusively financial. Does this mean that in future legislation we shall tie together expenditures for guided missiles with revenues from sales of postage stamps in an attempt to make ourselves believe that necessary defense expenditures are categories of expenditures which can be converted by mere statutory language into financially "self-liquidating" projects?

The pure power aspects of the project—with the possible exception of the Glen Canyon Dam—are financially infeasible, and the possible engineering and financial feasibility of the Glen Canyon portion of the project is seriously placed in doubt by physical and geological difficulties.

(A) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.

As members of the committee pointed out in the report on this bill, the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. The sandstone formation at Glen Canyon is reported to be nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified in March 1955 before the Committee's Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

Commissioner Dexheimer may be right, or he may be wrong. In any event, his final opinion should be requested together with complete supporting factual evidence.

(B) There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based.

The plans upon which costs of Glen Canyon Dam have been estimated are set forth in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project.

Members of the committee report that these plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam, in spite of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon—as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists—is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover Dam.

It would appear, therefore, that even if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document No. 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than now estimated.

Until further studies are made, neither I nor any other member of this body can safely speculate on the adequate size and possible cost of such a structure at Glen Canyon. Such studies can and should be made before this legislation is given any further consideration.

(C) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

Although the new bill now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates.

As presently planned, according to members of the committee, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but water could seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this national monument.

There is no reason for failing to determine that adequate protective measures can be provided before passage of this legislation.

(D) Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Members of the committee have informed us that geologic reports show that the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains Basins—both adjacent to the reservoir site—contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 340 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water.

Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project.

Since these basins are reported to have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, would it not appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir before proceeding with this legislation?

(E) The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained.

Chinle shale is a geologic formation which, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud.

Chinle shale is reported to immediately underlie the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir area, and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for those overlying cliff-forming rocks. As a result, as the reservoir filled with water, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumple and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The Chinle shale problem is not a new one, and it could easily be further investigated by experts before construction of the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Neglected United States Geological Survey reports show that the Chinle shale has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River has been reported to appear similar.

None of these engineering problems arising from physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit are new. Surveys of the area, now three decades old, indicated that the Glen Canyon site is an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If over $421 million is to be spent here, as the Bureau estimates, the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress can and should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

I believe that proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project have not well proven their case. It may be that some individual units may be worthwhile and economically and financially feasible, but as the project is outlined at present, it is a very weak and indefinite structure indeed. There are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project have never fully revealed the detrimental effects upon the operation of facilities in the lower Colorado River Basin of the proposed construction, filling, and operation of large holdover reservoirs on the main stream and major tributaries above Lee Ferry. Such vague generalities as have been stated have been based primarily upon consideration of the water supply of the Colorado River during periods such as 1897 to 1943 or 1914 to 1945 which included some early years of high runoff. The water supply in the period 1930 to 1954 was considerably below the averages for these earlier periods. It is not unlikely that the pattern and average of the water supply during the period of construction and filling of the proposed upper basin holdover reservoirs would be similar to the pattern and average of

the period 1930 to 1954. Well-established principles of project planning would dictate that such a period of low historical flow be considered, as well as periods of high flow, in any study of the effects of a project on existing facilities. The 1930 to 1954 interval provides the safest basis for appraisal of the need for and effects of large additional storage capacity in the upper basin.

To demonstrate the effects of the operation of proposed upstream storage reservoirs in conjunction with the operation of Lake Mead during a period of water supply such as 1930 to 1954, a group of hypothetical studies was made by engineers of the Colorado River Board of California. These studies show that in such a period the unrestricted filling and operation of upper basin storage reservoirs, such as at Glen Canyon, would place lower basin consumptive use of water in jeopardy and would violate existing lower basin power contracts. It was shown that, in order to avoid serious detriment to users of water and power in the lower basin, some rigid limitations must be placed upon the filling and operation of the upper basin storage reservoirs.

The studies covered sufficient variety and range to circumscribe probable operating conditions and principles, including assumptions that Glen Canyon reservoir would be full or empty at the start of the period, and Lake Mead full or half full; that the reservoirs would be operated primarily to fully meet annual consumptive use requirements downstream, to generate contract firm power at Hoover, to accumulate storage at Glen Canyon, or to hold Lake Mead above minimum desirable level; and various combinations of these different assumptions. As bases for comparison, studies were made of hypothetical Lake Mead operations using the 1930 to 1954 flow data and assuming the reservoir full to spillway crest elevation initially and also assuming the initial usable content equal to the actual usable content in January 1955.

In all the studies consideration was given to the delivery obligation of the upper basin under article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact. Requirements for water from the main stream for consumptive uses in the lower basin and for delivery to Mexico, plus irrecoverable losses from the main stream in the lower basin, were estimated at 10,200,000 acre-feet a year on the basis of present uses and expected increases as shown in table I. The corresponding average annual flow required at Lee Ferry was estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Required flows at Lee Ferry to provide contract firm power generation at the Hoover plant were calculated at 10,140,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 500-foot head on the plant and at 11,100,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 450-foot head, the September 1955 level. In all the studies the assumption was made that beneficial consumptive uses of water in the upper basin, estimated at present at approximately 2 million acre-feet a year, would increase during the 25-year study period at a uniform rate of 80,000 acre-feet a year.

TABLE I.—*Estimate of channel and reservoir losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River and in Mexico in a future period of water supply comparable with 1930–54*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	California net use [1]	Arizona net use [2]	Mexican requirement [3]	Unrecovered loss in All-American Canal to Drop No. 1 [4]	Net channel loss below Hoover Dam [5]	Evaporation losses from 6 reservoirs [6]	Nevada net use [7]	Total main stream use and loss in lower basin and Mexico (rounded) [8]
1955	4,590	1,060	1,700	200	600	1,200	23	9,400
1956	4,670	1,090	1,700	200	600	1,200	26	9,500
1957	4,750	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	29	9,600
1958	4,820	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	32	9,650
1959	4,900	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	35	9,700
1960	4,980	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	38	9,800
1961	5,050	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	41	9,900
1962	5,130	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	44	10,000
1963	5,210	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	47	10,050
1964	5,285	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	50	10,100
1965	5,360	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	53	10,200

[1] Projected from Colorado River Board monthly water reports, with Metropolitan Water District aqueduct at full capacity by 1965.
[2] Projected from Colorado River Board water reports, with Gila and Yuma projects fully developed in 1955 and Colorado River Indian Reservation at full development in 1957.
[3] Required delivery under terms of 1944 Mexican treaty, plus allowance for regulatory losses.
[4] Derived from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers. This is the average for calendar years 1946–52, rounded.
[5] Based on data in Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, and on differences in flow between Topock and Imperial Dam, taken from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[6] From Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, p. B–77. The 6 dams are Hoover, Davis, Parker, Headgate Rock, Imperial, and Laguna.
[7] Estimated from U. S. Geological Survey records of diversions from Lake Mead for Nevada, 1950–54.
[8] Amounts required at Lee Ferry would be approximately 600,000 acre-feet per year less, because of average tributary inflow below Lee Ferry.

The following conclusions were drawn by the engineers from the operation studies, based on the water supply of the 1930 to 1954 period and upon the premise that such a 25-year supply may well be representative of that which can be expected during the filling of the proposed upper basin reservoirs:

First. With no accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period the water supply would be more than adequate to satisfy the lower basin main stream consumptive use requirements and the Mexican Treaty requirements with the regulation provided by Lake Mead alone; but the firm power commitments at Hoover Dam could only be met if Lake Mead were full or nearly full at the start.

Second. Obviously any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period would further reduce the possibility of firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Third. Even if Lake Mead were full to spillway level at the start, the accumulation of storage in upper basin reservoirs in excess of about 10 million acre-feet during such a period would cause a deficit in firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Fourth. In such a period of runoff Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled even at a uniform rate to its total capacity without causing a damaging curtailment of about three-quarters of a million acre-feet annually in consumptive uses of water by presently existing facilities in the lower basin, in addition to serious deficits in Hoover firm power production. If Glen Canyon Reservoir were to be brought to full capacity in less than 25 years, curtailment of lower basin uses might be nearly a million acre-feet a year because of increased evaporation loss from Glen.

Fifth. If the Colorado River storage project is not to seriously damage the lower basin, the increment in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year must be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lee Ferry would otherwise exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no holdover storage in the upper basin.

Although the studies deal primarily with the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead, the conclusions drawn apply with equal or greater force to the effect of a group of several large holdover reservoirs as now proposed for construction in the upper basin.

THE WATER SUPPLY

As shown in table II, the estimated average annual virgin discharge of Colorado River at Lee Ferry, the compact division point, for the 25-year dry period beginning with 1930 is about 13 million acre-feet. This is only 85 percent of the estimated average of 15,600,000 acre-feet for the 1914 to 1945 period used by the Reclamation Bureau as the basis for its planning of the Colorado River storage project. The following tabulation compares the estimated average virgin flow at Lee Ferry for the 1930 to 1954 period with the estimated averages for other periods:

Period	Average virgin flow at Lee Ferry	Percent of 1930–54 average	Percent of 1914–45 average	Reference
	Acre-feet			
1914–45	15,600,000	117	100	H. Doc. 364, 83d Cong.
1930–54	13,300,000	100	85	Table III.
1914–29	18,000,000	135	115	H. Doc. 364.
1931–40 (driest decade)	11,800,000	89	76	Do.
1914–54	15,100,000	114	97	H. Doc. 364 and table III.
1934 (driest year)	5,210,000	39	33	Table III.

TABLE II.—*Water supply at Lees Ferry in the period 1930–54*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [1]	Historical flow of Paria River at Lees Ferry [1]	Calculated historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [2]	Estimated actual upstream depletion [3]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry [4]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry division point [5]
1930	12,390	21	12,410	1,820	14,210	14,230
1931	6,218	10	6,230	1,380	7,600	7,610
1932	15,130	38	15,170	1,960	17,090	17,130
1933	9,733	18	9,750	1,610	11,340	11,360
1934	3,948	18	3,970	1,240	5,190	5,210
1935	10,270	17	10,290	1,640	11,910	11,930
1936	12,110	37	12,150	1,830	13,940	13,980
1937	11,980	26	12,010	1,840	13,820	13,850
1938	15,640	26	15,670	2,110	17,750	17,780
1939	8,839	33	8,870	1,690	10,530	10,560
1940	7,589	28	7,620	1,520	9,110	9,140
1941	17,860	32	17,890	2,100	19,960	19,990
1942	14,790	15	14,800	2,100	16,890	16,900
1943	11,410	22	11,430	1,840	13,250	13,270
1944	13,020	14	13,030	1,930	14,950	14,960
1945	11,770	21	11,790	1,870	13,640	13,660
1946	8,751	22	8,770	1,680	10,430	10,450
1947	14,050	22	14,070	1,960	16,010	16,030
1948	12,880	16	12,900	1,930	14,810	14,830
1949	14,600	20	14,620	2,020	16,620	16,640
1950	10,800	13	10,810	1,840	12,640	12,650
1951	9,901	15	9,920	1,820	11,720	11,740
1952	17,904	17	17,920	2,180	20,080	20,100
1953	8,730	18	8,750	1,750	10,480	10,500
1954	6,162	16	6,180	1,640	7,800	7,820
Total	286,475	535	287,020	45,300	331,770	332,320
Average	11,460	21	11,480	1,810	13,270	13,290

[1] From U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers and provisional records.
[2] Sum of historical flows of Paria and Colorado Rivers at Lees Ferry, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[3] From 1953 Memorandum Supplement to U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, November 1952, p. 25. Depletions for 1952, 1953, and 1954 are estimated by assuming same transbasin diversions as 1951 and same irrigation depletions as in years of comparable flow, 1941, 1946, and 1940, respectively. Water-year depletions are assumed equal to calendar-year depletions.
[4] Colorado River above mouth of Paria River, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[5] Includes flow of Paria River.

The average annual tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam for the 1930 to 1954 period was estimated at 630,000 acre-feet, comprising 20,000 acre-feet from Paria River and 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry—compact division point—and Hoover Dam as is indicated by table III. On the basis of these estimates the average annual virgin flow into Lake Mead during the period would have been 13,900,000 acre-feet.

TABLE III.—*Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to delivery at Lees Ferry*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow, Colorado River at Lees Ferry	Historical flow, Colorado River at Grand Canyon	Historical flow, Little Colorado River at Grand Falls or near Cameron	Estimated net inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam	Estimated tributary inflow except Virgin River 2×(5)+(4)	Historical flow of Virgin River at Littlefield	Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to flow at Lees Ferry
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1930	12,390	12,760	180	190	560	210	770
1931	6,220	6,590	200	170	540	110	650
1932	15,130	15,820	430	260	950	380	1,330
1933	9,730	10,040	160	150	460	120	580
1934	3,950	4,190	40	200	440	80	520
1935	10,270	10,620	220	130	480	160	640
1936	12,110	12,470	170	190	550	140	690
1937	11,980	12,540	340	220	780	230	1,010
1938	15,640	15,860	160	60	280	280	560
1939	8,840	9,090	80	170	420	150	570
1940	7,590	8,040	190	260	710	180	890
1941	17,860	18,790	590	340	1,270	430	1,700
1942	14,790	14,920	90	40	170	190	360
1943	11,410	11,620	100	110	320	180	500
1944	13,020	13,330	130	180	490	180	670
1945	11,770	12,110	160	180	520	180	700
1946	8,750	9,120	140	230	600	170	770
1947	14,050	14,350	170	130	430	130	560
1948	12,880	13,010	130	0	130	110	240
1949	14,600	14,620	290	[1] 0	290	160	450
1950	10,800	10,840	40	0	40	120	160
1951	9,900	9,930	60	[1] 0	60	110	170
1952	17,900	18,100	350	[1] 0	350	300	650
1953	8,730	8,800	50	20	90	100	190
1954	6,160	6,300	110	30	170	140	310
Total					11,100	4,540	15,640
Average					444	182	626

[1] Negative result assumed as zero.

Source of data: U. S. Geodetic Survey water supply papers and provisional U. S. Geodetic Survey records.
The flows in col. (5) are obtained by subtracting the values of cols. (2) and (4) from col. (3). As suggested on p. 281 of the Colorado River, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, 1946, col. (6) is based on the assumption that net minor tributary inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam equals that between Lees Ferry and Grand Canyon.

WATER REQUIREMENTS FROM MAIN STREAM IN LOWER BASIN AND MEXICO

It was estimated that annual requirements for main stream channel and reservoir losses, beneficial consumptive uses of main stream water in the lower basin, and the Mexican Treaty burden will total in the near future, say 1965, about 10,200,000 acre-feet. This estimate is shown in table I. Allowance was made for estimated evaporation losses from all existing lower basin main stream reservoirs including Lake Mead. The annual quantity of 10,200,000 acre-feet would have to be supplied by flow at Lees Ferry—and net inflow between Lees Ferry—and Hoover Dam.

CHANNEL LOSSES

The loss from the channel of the main stream below Hoover Dam, exclusive of losses from reservoirs, were estimated at approximately 600,000 acre-feet a year for the 1930–54 period. Figures in table IV, showing the computation of the 600,000 acre-feet, are mostly for the period 1930 to 1937 which is considered representative of a future period comparable with 1930 to 1954.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated lower basin channel losses main stream, 1930–54*

	Average annual acre-feet
1. Decrease in flow, Topock to Imperial Dam [1]	602,000
2. Gross diversion, Palo Verde Irrigation District [1]	(190,000)
Net, estimated 46 percent of gross	87,000
3. Gross diversion, Colorado River Indian Reservation [1]	(25,000)
Net, estimated 67 percent of gross	17,000
4. Net loss, Topock to Imperial Dam (1–2–3)	498,000
5. Inflow, Bill Williams River [1]	113,000
6. Minor tributaries above Gila River [2]	40,000
7. Gross loss, Topock to Imperial	651,000
8. Net loss, Hoover Dam to Topock (estimated 40 percent of item 7) [2]	260,000
9. Total (4+8) say	800,000
10. Evaporation, Headgate Rock and Imperial Dams [2]	68,000
11. Channel loss replaced by evaporation from Havasu and Mohave [2]	136,000
12. Estimated net channel loss, Hoover Dam to Imperial (9–10–11) say	600,000

[1] U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[2] U. S. Bureau of Reclamation report on Central Arizona project.

In the calculation no allowance was made for flow from Gila River into the main stream. The water supply of the Gila Basin is already overdeveloped. It was estimated that if a water-supply period such as 1930 to 1954 were repeated in the future, the annual flows of the Gila River at the mouth would be negligible except in the calendar years corresponding to 1932, 1937, and 1941. Even the flows in these years would be unavailable practically to help satisfy Colorado River requirements, due to the infrequent, flashy nature of the runoff.

BENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

In the calendar year 1954, net beneficial consumptive uses of mainstream Colorado River water in Arizona, California, and Nevada, according to Colorado River board monthly water reports and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Water Log of the Colorado River, were Arizona, 961,720; California, 4,423,095; and Nevada, 19,876 acre-

feet, respectively. It is shown in table I that in the next 10 years these annual uses will increase to 1,100,000, 5,362,000, and 53,000 acre-feet, respectively. These estimates are based upon the assumptions that existing mainstream projects in Arizona will be fully developed, that the aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will be flowing at full capacity within the 10 years, and that uses in Nevada will increase at the same rate they have in recent years.

WATER REQUIRED FOR FIRM POWER AT HOOVER DAM

For the first calendar year of the 25-year study period, the contract requirement for firm Hoover power was taken as 4,182,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was the 1955 requirement. The contract commitment is 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours less in each of the following years, and is therefore reduced to 3,972,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the last calendar year of the period; the 25-year average is 4,077,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

With an effective head of 500 feet and an efficiency of 80 percent at the Hoover powerplant, the required average annual flow through the plant to satisfy firm-power commitments, using 1955 to 1979 average contract requirements, would be 9,940,000 acre-feet. With a 500-foot head on the plant, the average annual evaporation loss from Lake Mead was estimated at 810,000 acre-feet. An average annual tributary inflow of 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, as estimated for 1930 to 1954, would compensate for most of this loss, leaving a remainder of 200,000 acre-feet per year to be made up. Therefore, to meet firm-power requirements at a 500-foot head, and to keep Lake Mead at that operating level, yearly flow at Lee Ferry would have to be 9,940,000 acre-feet plus 200,000 acre-feet, or a total of 10,140,000 acre-feet.

As of September 1955, the effective head on the Hoover plant was only about 450 feet. With such a low head the annual flow through the Hoover turbines would have to be 11,300,000 acre-feet to meet present firm-power commitments. If the present Lake Mead water level were maintained throughout the 1955 to 1979 interval, the required average annual discharge from the Hoover powerhouse to comply with firm-power contracts would be 11,050,000 acre-feet. Average annual evaporation loss at that level is estimated at 660,000 acre-feet. Allowing for the 610,000 acre-feet of estimated tributary inflow, the average annual flow requirement at Lees Ferry would be 11,100,000 acre-feet.

OPERATION STUDIES

Studies were made on an annual basis, using 1930–54 watersupply figures, of the operation of Lake Mead alone and of the operation of Lake Mead and Glen Canyon together, under various assumptions and criteria. The results are shown in table V. The general conclusions reached in the studies are valid regardless of the number of mainstream holdover storage reservoirs that might be constructed above Lee Ferry. For the studies, the following assumptions were made:

First. In the period of operation, the water supply would be the same as in the 25-year period January 1, 1930, through December 31, 1954.

Second. Flow into Glen Canyon Reservoir during the 25-year operation period would be equal to the historical calendar-year flow at Lees Ferry, taken from United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers, diminished by additional upstream depletions which are assumed on the basis of Reclamation Bureau estimates to increase at the rate of 80,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Inflow to Lake Mead would equal the sum of the calculated release from Glen Canyon Reservoir, the Little Colorado River and the Virgin River, plus the estimated net yearly minor-tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam. For the study of Lake Mead alone the historical flow at Lees Ferry, modified by additional upstream depletions, was used instead of the release from Glen Canyon.

Fourth. Evaporation from Glen Canyon Reservoir is estimated at an average rate of 4.7 feet per year, deduced from United States Bureau of Reclamation data in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session.

Fifth. Net evaporation from Lake Mead is estimated at an average rate of 7 feet per year on the basis of United States Geological Survey monthly records and studies by C. L. Patterson, August 1950.

TABLE V.—*Results of operation studies for Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead*

[Volumes in thousands of acre-feet with water supply as in period 1930–54]

Study No.	Glen Canyon			Hoover					
	Initial total storage	Final total storage	Average release	Initial usable storage	Final usable storage	Average usable storage	Average release	Average firm power deficit (million kilowatt-hours)	Average secondary power (million kilowatt-hours)
1	(1)	(1)	(1)	24,750	16,080	23,000	10,400	0	561
2	0	0	10,420	12,760	4,640	7,400	10,860	595	0
3	0	6,000	9,950	12,760	4,640	6,170	10,440	870	0
4	0	10,780	9,670	24,750	24,750	21,630	9,350	15	0
5	0	26,000	8,900	24,750	14,420	19,480	9,060	245	0
6	0	6,200	9,920	12,760	17,480	17,120	9,550	186	0
7	26,000	16,730	10,120	24,750	24,750	24,750	9,700	0	340
8	0	20,620	9,030	24,750	20,300	21,230	9,200	334	135
9	0	13,580	9,510						

[1] Glen Canyon Reservoir nonexistent.

Study No. 1, Lake Mead alone.

Start: Full to spillway.

Priorities: First, firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, secondary power.

In the first operation study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest elevation at the beginning of the period, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir was considered nonexistent. Starting with Lake Mead full an attempt was made, first, to meet firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead at its initial level; and third, to generate secondary power.

The study indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the beginning of a period such as 1930–54, it could be operated to generate firm power commitments in every year, and an average of more than 500 million kilowatt-hours a year of secondary energy. Average annual release of water would be more than enough to supply downstream consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico. However, the storage would be drawn down more than 8 million acre-feet at the end of the period.

Final usable storage, 16,080,000 acre-feet.

Average usable storage, 23 million acre-feet.

Average release, 10,400,000 acre-feet per year.

Average secondary power, 561 million kilowatt-hours per year.

Study No. 2, Mead and Glen Canyon.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold level of Lake Mead; third, fill Glen.

In the second study it was assumed that the water surface elevation in Lake Mead at the beginning of the 25-year period of study would be the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, or 1,105.5 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, an attempt was made, first, to supply firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to hold 12,760,000 acre-feet of usable storage in Lake Mead; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Reservoir without detention for dead storage. The minimum allowable water surface elevation in Lake Mead was taken arbitrarily as 1,000.0 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 4,640,000 acre-feet and a powerhead of 350 feet.

Study No. 2 indicates that with Mead only half full at the start, Hoover firm power commitments could not be met and no storage could be accumulated in Glen Canyon Reservoir in the 25-year period. No secondary power could be generated at Hoover. However, the water release would more than supply downstream consumptive uses and Mexico.

This study may be considered equivalent for practical purposes to a study of Lake Mead alone. Glen Canyon would be useless. In fact, Lake Mead usable storage would drop dangerously low.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 7,400,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 10,860,000; Glen, 10,420,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 595 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 3, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, bring Glen to dead-storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold level of Mead; fourth, fill Glen.

In the third study, the assumptions and criteria were the same as in study No. 2, except that in No. 3 it was assumed necessary to maintain storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir above a certain minimum in order to obtain the required outflow. Accordingly, this reservoir would be brought to dead-storage level, corresponding to 6 million acre-feet of total content, in the first calendar year of the period of study. Thereafter, this level would be considered the minimum allowable.

As would be expected, study No. 3 indicates about the same limitations as No. 2, but with somewhat greater deficit in Hoover firm power and slightly less average release from Hoover, although still more than enough for downstream requirements. Again, Glen Canyon would be practically useless.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, 6 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 6,170,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Mead, 10,440,000; Glen, 9,950,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 870 million kilowatts; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 4, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen to dead storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full; fourth, fill Glen.

In the fourth study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest, elevation 1,205.4, at the beginning, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Starting with Lake Mead at this level and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, it was attempted, first, to supply firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead filled to the spillway lip; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. The minimum allowable water level in Lake Mead was considered to be elevation, 1,122, at which the usable storage is 14,420,000 acre-feet and the head on the powerplant is 472 feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir contents would be increased to dead-storage level in the first year but not increased further until a surplus was available after complying with Hoover firm-power contracts and filling Lake Mead to spillway elevation.

Study No. 4 indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the start of a water-supply period such as 1930–54, and the proper operating criteria were observed, the Hoover firm power and the downstream use requirements could be substantially met, and Glen Canyon might be partly but not completely filled.

The study indicates that with the assumed starting conditions and operating criteria the firm power commitments at Hoover could be nearly, but not quite met. A shortage of 375 million kilowatt-hours is indicated in 1 year, averaging 15 million kilowatt-hours a year for the period. It would be possible to keep Mead full about half the time, and to end with it full. Average annual water release would be about equal to consumptive requirements and Mexican Treaty obligation.

According to the hypothetical study Glen Canyon would begin to accumulate usable storage in the 13th year, would reach a maximum in the 23d year, and end the period less than half full.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 10,780,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,630,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,350,000 usable; Glen, 9,670,000.

Average annual firm power deficit: Mead, 15 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power Mead, none:

Comparison of study No. 4 with study No. 1 indicates that if Lake Mead started the period at spillway level, the detention of water in Glen Canyon Reservoir would deprive the Hoover plant of an annual average of 15 million kilowatt-hours of firm power and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power.

Study No. 5, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead, full to spillway; Glen, empty.

Priorities: First, fill Glen; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full.

In the fifth study, Lake Mead was assumed filled to spillway crest at the beginning of operation, with 24,750,000 acre-feet of usable storage. Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed empty at the start. It would be filled to dead storage level in the first year, and thereafter storage would be increased at a uniform rate calculated to arrive at full capacity of 26 million acre-feet at the end of the 25th year. This study therefore gave the highest priority to the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir, second preference to the firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam, and third to filling Lake Mead to spillway crest. The minimum allowable usable storage in Lake Mead was assumed at 14,420,000 acre-feet as in study No. 4.

Study No. 5 indicates that even with Lake Mead full at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without damaging curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses, and substantial drawdown of Lake Mead. The study indicates an average yearly firm-power shortage of 245 million kilowatt-hours at the Hoover plant. Lake Mead would be reduced to the minimum usable storage of 14,420,000 acre-feet at the end of the 25 years and in several other years of the study period. Average yearly discharge below Hoover Dam would be insufficient for downstream requirements.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 14,420,000 usable; Glen, 26 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 19,480,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,060,000; Glen, 8,900,000.

Average annual power deficit, Mead, 245 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Comparison of study No. 5 with study No. 1 indicates that with Lake Mead starting full, the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir during a 25-year period of water supply such as 1930–54, would reduce the average annual Hoover power production by about 245 million kilowatt-hours of firm and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power, in addition to reducing the water supply for the lower basin and Mexico about 1,500,000 acre-feet a year.

Study No. 6, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Mead to 500 feet head; second, Hoover firm power; third, fill Glen.

In the sixth study Lake Mead's water surface elevation at the start of the period was assumed the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, Lake Mead usable storage would be increased as soon as possible to 17,480,000 acre-feet, corresponding to an effective head of 500 feet on the Hoover plant. The study indicated that this head probably could be maintained to the end of the period. Hoover firm-power requirements would be given priority over storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Reservoir without detention for dead storage.

Study No. 6 indicates that if, starting with Lake Mead at its present level, the lake were operated to attain as quickly as possible a satisfactory power head on Hoover plant, to maintain such head and meet firm power and downstream water requirements, little retention of storage could be accomplished in upper basin reservoirs during a water supply period like 1930 to 1954. The study indicates that under the above assumptions and criteria firm power production could be attained at Hoover in all years after the head had been built up to the 500-foot point. Deficits probably would occur while that head was being attained. Indicated average yearly release from Hoover would be enough for downstream requirements. Storage in Glen Canyon probably could be brought to nearly two-thirds capacity in about the 23d year, according to the study, but would have to be drawn down nearly to dead storage level at the end of the period.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,480,000 usable; Glen, 6,200,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,120,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,550,000; Glen, 9,920,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 186 million kilowatt-hours.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 7, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen full.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, hold Glen full; fourth, secondary power.

At the beginning of the seventh operation study, Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed at full capacity and Lake Mead filled to spillway crest. It was attempted first, to generate contract firm power at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead full to spillway level; third, to keep Glen Canyon Reservoir full; and fourth, to generate secondary Hoover power.

Study No. 7 indicates that if Glen Canyon Reservoir were full to capacity at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, and Lake Mead were at spillway crest, the two could be so operated that Hoover firm power commitments and downstream water requirements could be met, and some secondary power generated, at the cost of some drawdown in storage. If Lake Mead were held full to spillway level, as in the study, the drawdown at Glen would be about 9 million acre-feet.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 16,730,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 23,840,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,700,000; Glen, 10,120,000.

Firm power deficit, Mead none; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 340 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of this analysis with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 700,000 acre-feet, and diminish Hoover secondary power generation by an average of 221,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. In both studies, firm power requirements are met.

Study No. 8, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen release, 7,500,000 acre-feet/year; second, fill Glen; third, Hoover firm power; fourth, fill Mead; fifth, secondary power.

At the start of the eighth operation study, Lake Mead was assumed full to spillway crest elevation and Glen Canyon Reservoir empty. The release from Glen Canyon Reservoir was never allowed to be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. After meeting this requirement, preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir and keeping it full. From the water available at Lake Mead, priority was given first, to supplying firm contract power; second, to filling Lake Mead; and third, to generating secondary power. The study is like Study No. 5 except for the requirement in No. 8 that Glen Canyon release should not be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet in any year. As would be expected, the results of study No. 8 are similar to those of No. 5, and reaffirm the conclusion that, even with Lake Mead full to spillway crest at the start of a water supply period like 1930–54, Glen Canyon could not be filled without curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses. Average annual water release from Hoover Dam indicated in Study No. 8 would be insufficient for downstream requirements, and Hoover firm output would be less than contract requirements. However, some secondary power would be produced in the years when both reservoirs would be full—Mead at spillway crest—and release of excess waters would be necessary.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 20,300,000 usable. Glen, 20,620,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,230,000 usable. Glen, 19,640,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,200,000; Glen, 9,030,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 334 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 135 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of study No. 8 with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir on this basis would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 1,200,000 acre-feet and reduce Hoover firm and secondary power annual averages by 334 million and 426 million kilowatt-hours, respectively.

Study No. 9, Glen alone.

Start: Empty.

Priorities: First, inflow to Mead, 10,200,000 acre-feet per year; second, fill Glen.

As discussed previously it was estimated that within the next 10 years reservoir and channel losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River plus requirements for delivery to Mexico, may total 10,200,000 acre-feet per year—see table I. In study No. 9, an attempt was made to maintain this amount as annual inflow to Lake Mead. Second preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir, starting with this reservoir empty.

Study No. 9 indicates that if Glen Canyon was to be so operated as to maintain, whenever possible, as annual inflow to Lake Mead, including tributary inflow between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam, at least equal to the 10,200,000 acre-feet required for lower basin consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico, the Glen Canyon reservoir could not be filled during a period of water supply like that in the 25 years 1930–54. According to the study, Glen Canyon if it started empty would be only about half filled at the end of the period, despite the indication that with the 1930–54 sequence of annual flows there would be in two of the years deficits in the required inflow to Lake Mead amounting to about 7.5 percent each. Furthermore, with such operation of Glen, the contract firm power requirements at Hoover Dam could not be met unless Lake Mead were at or near spillway level at the start of the period. If Lake Mead were at the 1955 level at the beginning of such a period, even with 10,200,000 acre-feet of inflow every year there would be a continuous and considerable shortage of firm power at the Hoover plant.

Final storage, acre-feet, Glen, 13,580,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet, Glen, 11,450,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Glen, 9,510,000 total.

In summary, after allowance for the assumed rate of increase of 80,000 acre-feet a year in upper basin depletions it was calculated that the average annual modified flow at Lees Ferry in a period such as 1930 to 1954 would be only about 10,400,000 acre-feet. The average annual flow required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, a supply sufficient for lower basin consumptive uses from the main stream and for delivery to Mexico is estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Average annual flows required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow amounts sufficient for Hoover firm power production during the period 1955 to 1979 range from 10,100,000 acre-feet with a 500-foot head on the plant to 11,100,000 acre-feet with a 450-foot head. Obviously if in a period of water supply like that of 1930 to 1954 these needs of the lower basin and Mexico were to be satisfied there would be little if any water left for accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin.

The studies I have described indicate that in a runoff period such as 1930 to 1954 the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without reducing the average annual Glen Canyon release below the 9,600,000 acre-feet—studies Nos. 4 and 9; and that accumulation of storage in Glen Canyon in excess of about 10 million acre-feet at the end of the 25-year study period would cause deficiencies in firm power production at Hoover Dam, even if Lake Mead were full at the start—study No. 4.

The studies I have described further show that if the upper basin is to develop additional consumptive uses of water approximately at the rate estimated by the Reclamation Bureau, and if at the same time reasonable assurance is to be given of a main stream supply adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico, some limitation must be placed upon the retention of water in the proposed upper basin holdover reservoirs. One such criterion would be to limit the increase in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed a specified quantity if there were no holdover reservoirs upstream; with the specified quantity so calculated that the annual average of the residual flow at Lees Ferry, plus tributary inflow, would be adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico.

Studies were made which show that in order to minimize damage to the lower basin, legislation authorizing construction and operation of large holdover storage reservoirs in the upper basin should include provision that the reduction in river flow due to storage increment and evaporation in any calendar year be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no hold-over storage in the upper basin. Informal discussions with my colleagues on the Interior Committee indicated it would be fruitless to propose such amendments.

Table VI shows the possible effects of such a limitation upon the residual flow at Lees Ferry and upon the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir, during a period like 1930 to 1954. It indicates that under the limitation the accumulated storage in Glen Canyon at the end of

such a period would be only about 12 million acre-feet, and that the resultant flow at Lees Ferry would average about 9,700,000 acre-feet a year. That average flow would be sufficient, with tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, to supply lower basin consumptive use requirements and the Mexican treaty obligation. It would be short of the flow required for Hoover firm power production, by about 4 percent if the average head on the Hoover plant were 500 feet and by about 13 percent if the average head were 450 feet.

TABLE VI.—*Flow at Lees Ferry if an amount equal to the modified historical flow (neglecting holdover storage) in excess of 12 million acre-feet annually were stored in the upper basin for holdover purposes*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow at Lees Ferry	Modified historical flow at Lees Ferry minus annual increase of 80,000 acre-feet in upper basin consumptive use	Modified historical flow in excess of 12 million acre-feet at Lees Ferry	Resulting flow at Lees Ferry if excess over 12 million acre-feet is stored in upper basin	Cumulative excess over 12 million acre-feet	Glen Canyon Reservoir		
						Average gross storage for year	Evaporation at 4.7 feet	Gross storage at end of year
1930	12,410	12,330	330	12,000	330	160	10	320
1931	6,230	6,070	0	6,070	330	310	20	300
1932	15,170	14,930	2,930	12,000	3,260	1,720	80	3,150
1933	9,750	9,430	0	9,430	3,260	3,080	130	3,020
1934	3,970	3,570	0	3,570	3,260	2,960	130	2,890
1935	10,290	9,810	0	9,810	3,260	2,830	120	2,770
1936	12,150	11,590	0	11,590	3,260	2,710	120	2,650
1937	12,010	11,370	0	11,370	3,260	2,600	110	2,540
1938	15,670	14,950	2,950	12,000	6,210	3,940	160	5,330
1939	8,870	8,070	0	8,070	6,210	5,230	200	5,130
1940	7,620	6,740	0	6,740	6,210	5,030	200	4,930
1941	17,890	16,930	4,930	12,000	11,140	7,260	270	9,590
1942	14,800	13,760	1,760	12,000	12,900	10,300	350	11,000
1943	11,430	10,310	0	10,310	12,900	10,820	370	10,630
1944	13,030	11,830	0	11,830	12,900	10,450	360	10,270
1945	11,790	10,510	0	10,510	12,900	10,100	350	9,920
1946	8,770	7,410	0	7,410	12,900	9,750	340	9,580
1947	14,070	12,630	630	12,000	13,530	9,720	340	9,870
1948	12,900	11,380	0	11,380	13,530	9,700	330	9,540
1949	14,620	13,020	1,020	12,000	14,550	9,880	340	10,220
1950	10,810	9,130	0	9,130	14,550	10,050	340	9,880
1951	9,920	8,160	0	8,160	14,550	9,710	340	9,540
1952	17,920	16,080	4,080	12,000	18,630	11,390	380	13,240
1953	8,750	6,830	0	6,830	18,630	13,020	430	12,810
1954	6,180	4,180	0	4,180	18,630	12,600	420	12,390
Total	287,020	261,020	18,630	242,390	----------	----------	6,240	----------
Average	11,480	10,440	740	9,700	----------	----------	250	----------

Studies previously discussed herein and summarized on table V show that in order to maintain full production of firm power at Hoover Dam in a future 25-year period like 1930–54, little or no storage could be accumulated at Glen Canyon unless Lake Mead were full to spillway level or nearly so at the beginning. With Lake Mead at its present level, the only legislative means of providing reasonable assurance of meeting firm power commitments at Hoover would be a prohibition of any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin in such a period, or at least until Lake Mead could be filled to spillway level.

REFERENCES

First. United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers and provisional records were used to obtain historical flows.

Second. House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, "Colorado River Storage Project," was used for basic data on Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

Third. For Lake Mead data, use was made of Revised Tables, Lake Mead Surface Area and Usable Capacity, Based on Survey of March 1948 to March 1949, prepared by Geological Survey, October 1949.

Fourth. Central Arizona project, appendixes to report, 1947, United States Bureau of Reclamation, was referred to in estimating channel and reservoir losses.

Fifth. United States Bureau of Reclamation 1953 memorandum supplement to Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, dated November 1952, was source of and basis of estimates for upper basin depletions.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 500, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the language of the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 500 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 3383, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The procedings whereby the bill H. R. 3383 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to one-half hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and one-half by me.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9536, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill containing appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for 14 Government agencies. The total amount appropriated in this bill is $14,849,275.

This bill contains an appropriation for the salary of the President of the United States which is, by law, fixed at $150,000; for expenses necessary for the White House Office, the amount of $1,875,000; for expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects the amount of $1,500,000.

This fund is used by the President for staff assistance on special problems which arise from time to time but cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Examples of the type of staff assistance provided during the current year are projects on disarmament, coordination of public works planning, and the coordination of foreign economic policy.

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, the subcommittee has allowed $383,775. These funds provide for the care, maintenance, and operation of the Executive Mansion and the surrounding grounds.

It might be of interest to the committee to know that the electric bill for power used in the White House is $30,890 per year; that there are 72 permanent employees at the White House; that last year there were over 600,000 visitors in the White House, and during last year the White House was closed for a period of 6 weeks; that in 1954 there were 826,843 visitors and that the

White House is now open to visitors 5 days a week from 10 a. m., to 12 noon, Tuesdays through Saturdays, and that approximately 8,000 visitors per day pass through the White House.

We have appropriations in this bill of $3,550,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, which is a slight decrease of $9,000 from the budget request. The Bureau assists the President in the discharge of his budgetary, management, and other executive responsibilities. The appropriation requested for 1957, together with estimated reimbursements, will support a total of 419 positions. This is 4 less than the number estimated for 1956, 16 less than for 1955. We were told during the current fiscal year the Bureau has continued to carry a heavy workload, which is not expected to grow lighter in the coming fiscal year.

For the Council of Economic Advisers the committee has allowed $350,000, which is $15,700 less than the budget request. The Council of Economic Advisers analyzes the national economy and its various segments; advises the President on economic developments; recommends policies for economic growth and stability; appraises economic programs and policies of the Federal Government; and assists in preparation of the annual economic report of the President to Congress.

In the opinion of this committee the National Security Council is one of the most important agencies of the Government. The Council advises the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security. The Central Intelligence Agency is under the direction of the Council. The Council includes the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Other high officials attend meetings or participate in Council actions as directed by the President.

The Council staff performs analysis, review functions for the Council and otherwise assists the Council in bringing about policy coordination. For this agency this committee has appropriated the full budget request of $248,000, which is $8,000 above the amount appropriated for 1956.

Appropriations for the Office of Defense Mobilization are included in this bill. The Office of Defense Mobilization directs and plans the nonmilitary mobilization effort and coordinates all mobilization activities of the executive branch of the Government. These activities include production, manpower, stabilization, transportation, telecommunications, and the stockpiling of strategic materials. It was comforting to the members of our subcommittee to learn that our stockpile program is in excellent condition from an overall standpoint, and that only a few items remain on the critical list. For this agency the committee has appropriated $2,200,000, which is $25,000 more than the 1956 appropriation but $83,000 less than the budget request.

For the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, the committee has allowed the sum of $57,500, which is $2,500 less than the 1956 appropriations and $2,500 less than the budget request for 1957. The President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization advises the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the identification of major organizational and management problems and the development of proposed corrective actions by means of reorganization plans for submission to Congress, Executive orders, and other administrative actions.

For the Emergency Fund for the President, we have provided $1 million, which is the amount that was appropriated for this fund in 1956. These funds are to enable the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense. As of February 15, 1956, when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before our committee to justify this request, no part of the fund appropriated for 1956 had been expended by the President.

For expenses necessary to assist the President in improving the management of executive agencies and in obtaining greater economy and efficiency through the establishment of more efficient business methods in Government operations, the committee has allowed $350,000, which is a reduction of $50,000 below the budget request. These funds enable the President to have studies conducted of the organization and operations of the executive branch and to develop and install improvements therein.

The committee allowed the full budget request of $2,140,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission. One million one hundred forty thousand dollars of this two million one hundred forty thousand dollars is for salaries and expenses and the other $1 million is for construction of memorials and cemeteries. It was the unanimous opinion of the subcommitte that this Commission has done an outstanding job. Under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Thomas North, who has served as Secretary to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the construction program is nearing completion at about 2 or 3 million dollars less than the cost originally estimated. General North has done a fine job. In my opinion he is one of our finest public servants, and I certainly hope he remains with the Commission until the job has been completed.

The Commission is responsible for the maintenance and operation of all permanent United States military cemeteries and memorials located in foreign countries. These include 8 World War I cemeteries, a memorial chapel in each cemetery, 11 World War I memorials outside the cemeteries, 14 World War II cemeteries, and the United States National Cemetery, Mexico City, Mexico. The higher estimate in 1957 for maintenance and operation reflects increasing requirements due to completion of various features of the construction program in World War II cemeteries and requirements for major repairs to be undertaken in the World War I cemeteries.

The estimate covers the eighth year's program requirements for construction of United States military cemeteries in foreign countries and memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces in World War II. Construction covers the development of 15 locations in foreign countries and includes permanent headstones, erection of a memorial structure at each location, and other features such as landscaping, roads and paths, drainage, water supply, caretakers' houses, and visitors' and utility buildings required for operating purposes. In 1957 construction of a memorial in the national cemetery in Hawaii, and memorials on the east and west coast of the United States will be initiated.

Again, let me say in my opinion the American Battle Monuments Commission, under the able leadership of General North, has done an outstanding job. It was my pleasure to visit many of the cemeteries in Europe last August and September, and the beauty of these cemeteries is indescribable. The relatives of those who lie buried in our cemeteries overseas can rest assured that no expense has been spared in making these cemeteries as attractive as possible.

For the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission the committee has allowed $695,000, which is a reduction of $11,905 from the 1956 bill and $5,000 less than the budget request. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is responsible for the settlement of claims authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948 and such other foreign claims as assigned. With the practical conclusion of settlement of World War II claims—the statutory deadline is August 31, 1956—the greater portion of administrative expenses must be met by appropriation, since the programs remaining do not provide for the financing of administrative expense from assets. The Chairman of the Commission indicated that, barring the passage of legislation authorizing additional claims programs, the work of the Commission should be completed by September 30, 1959.

For the Subversive Activities Control Board the Committee has allowed $350,000, which is $51,400 more than the appropriation for this agency during 1956. The volume of the workload of this Board is dependent upon the number of petitions filed by the Attorney General's office with the Board. Upon petitions being filed, the Board holds formal hearings and determines whether: First, organizations are Communist-action organizations, Communist-front organizations, or Communist-infiltrated organizations; second, individuals are officers or members of a Communist-action organization or officers of a Communist-front organization and required to register as such; third, the registration of particular Communist-action organizations or Communist-front organizations or of particular individuals should be canceled; and fourth, a particular organization has ceased to be a Communist-infiltrated organization. In each case the Board issues a report setting forth its ruling and findings as to the facts, and issues an appropriate order. The appeal by the Communist Party of the United States from the Board's order that the party register as a Communist-action organization is before the Supreme Court. Two Communist-front cases are before the United

States Court of Appeals. It is expected that hearings in about 10 front and infiltrated cases will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1956, and an additional 12 or more will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1957. Since the committee hearings of the previous year, the rate of referral cases has increased, and it is apparent that the present small staff cannot maintain a desirable rate of progress. The amount provided will allow for a modest number of additional personnel and will thus enable the Board to proceed more effectively.

In conclusion, the total amount carried in this bill for the 14 agencies of Government is $14,849,275, which is $13,067,025 less than the amount carried in the 1956 appropriation bill for these same agencies, or an appropriation decrease of nearly 50 percent. The amount included in this bill is $165,200 less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for these agencies.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may have answered this question. I should like to ask the question, however, and I propose to ask the chairman of every appropriation committee that comes in here from now on the same question. Under the terms of this bill has employment increased?

Mr. ANDREWS. No. The increases under this bill where there are increases are due to the salary increase bill that the Congress passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any super grade positions made available under this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not under this bill.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. In discussing the American Battle Monuments Commission, this bill provides for that commission $2,140,000. Is it not true that a large part of that amount will be counterpart funds?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Under our present arrangement, a year or two ago the Congress directed that those funds should go through the Treasury so that they could be properly accounted for. We now appropriate the dollars for the counterpart funds and those funds are purchased from the Treasury; therefore a part of these expenditures will be paid with counterpart funds which have been purchased from the United States Treasury with the dollars we have provided here?

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there is a million dollars appropriated for disaster relief in the President's budget and that nothing has been spent? And there is an appropriation of a million dollars there this year?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is known as his emergency fund.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield, I thought that the gentleman from Alabama had misunderstood the question. The gentleman asked about disaster relief. This is for national defense emergencies There is another fund covering disaster relief.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and the other members of the committee for what I consider to be an excellent job and to tell the gentleman from Alabama that we miss him on the independent offices subcommittee.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the General Government Matters Appropriations Subcommittee, as you know, considers requests for appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and other agencies or commissions having direct bearing on the Office of the President.

In addition, it also considers the requests of the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Foreign Claims Commission, and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The total amount sanctioned by the Bureau of the Budget for all the agencies for fiscal 1957 was $15,014,475.

The Appropriations Committee allowed $14,849,275, a reduction of $165,200.

This reduction of $165,200 is a modest decrease and will in no way affect the functioning of the agencies involved, in the opinion of the committee.

As a matter of fact, $133,000 of the $165,200 was taken from 2 of the agencies: $83,000 from the Office of Defense Mobilization and $50,000 from the item "Expenses of Management Improvement" in funds appropriated to the President.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

With the conclusion of settlement of World War II claims—the deadline is August 31, 1956—the greater portion of administrative expenses must be met by appropriation, since the programs remaining do not provide for the financing of administrative expenses from assets.

To wind up the work of this Commission—barring any further legislation for additional claims programs—the Chairman of the Commission estimates it will take 3 more years—about September 30, 1959.

Approximately $156 million in German and Japanese World War II assets was used in administering and paying World War II claims authorized under the War Claims Act of 1948—Public Law 744, 83d Congress, authorized compensation of additional World War II claims which are also being paid out of these German and Japanese assets. A total of $225 million of such assets has been deposited in the War Claims fund to date.

On the completion of this program it is estimated that there will remain in the War Claims fund $15 million or more.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The Office of Defense Mobilization under the directorship of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, is to my mind doing a splendid job. This office was created June 12, 1953, by Reorganization Plan No. 3 which put in 1 central agency what had previously been 3 separate agencies and parts of 2 others. Thus was created for the first time in our history a single Presidential Staff Agency responsible for assisting the President in carrying out central leadership, direction, and coordination of the Nation's current defense mobilization program, defense readiness measures such as stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and development of those programs and actions that would be needed in event of full mobilization such as distribution controls for critical materials and stabilization measures.

In addition to being the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Director [Dr. Flemming], is by law a member of the National Security Council and participates in cabinet meetings on invitation of the President.

As Chairman of the Defense Mobilization Board which consists of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor; Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. This Board provides the means for coordinating the policies and activities of the principal departments and agencies participating in the defense program.

The Office of Defense Mobilization also requires the knowledge, cooperation, and active participation of all elements of our national life—industry, business, labor, agriculture, State and local governments and the professions for effective mobilization readiness.

The importance of this agency becomes very apparent to those of us who are privileged to hear off-the-record discussions by various members of our State and Defense Departments.

There is no way of estimating all of the fine work done by this agency.

Mr. Chairman, the many functions of the Director of Mobilization necessarily call for sufficient funds for the office to be effective. We trust that the $2,200,000 allotted in this appropriation for fiscal 1957 will suffice.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do not rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader if he will please inform us of the program for tomorrow, Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for calling this matter to our attention. On tomorrow, we have three matters before the House, to be considered in the following order.

House Resolution 356, Government Operations Committee—operating funds.

H. R. 9428, Armed Forces, Army-Navy, Public Health Services, medical officers, procurement.

H. R. 9429, Armed Forces, medical care for dependents.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a spirit of deep sadness and humility that I rise today to pay homage to a great American statesman who preceded me here for 11 years.

He was Congressman John Jennings, Jr., who passed away Monday, February 27, at 8:10 p. m. at the Baptist Hospital, Knoxville, Tenn.

Many of you here served with him in the House of Representatives and you knew, loved, and respected him.

You remember him for his great crusade for the Republican Party, for his outstanding work on the Judiciary Committee, and for his unusual ability as an orator and for his love of telling entertaining stories.

The "judge" as he is referred to by the majority of the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, was, indeed, a colorful figure. He was forceful in his support of an issue or of a candidate in an election and he was just as vigorous in his opposition.

I know whereof I speak.

I fitted into both categories.

Judge Jennings and I, on occasions in Tennessee politics, supported each other for public offices and then we were opponents in a Republican primary election. I always respected him for his strong and zealous fight for the principles which he felt were right. I shall continue to admire and respect his memory. He was a man with an abundance of energy and who would not let up.

The judge and I again became good friends, and to show his disposition and rare expression, I quote to you from a recent note I received from him:

> Thanks for all you've done and for your good telegram of the 13th. You had your fences pig-tight, mule-high, and bull-strong.

Those words are symbolic of John Jennings' exuberant manner and of saying what he had to say.

Last summer, he sent to my wife and me a bushel of the finest tomatoes I had ever seen which he raised on his farm.

Deriving the title of "judge" from his office as chancellor of the second chancery division of Tennessee, Judge Jennings began his public career in Jellico, Campbell County, Tenn., in 1903. His first office was superintendent of the county schools there. He was Campbell County attorney from 1911 to 1918 and he was a delegate to 3 Republican national conventions—1912, 1936, and 1944. He was special assistant to the attorney general of the United States in 1918–19, and he made his first race for Congress in 1922 against the late beloved J. Will Taylor. Congressman Taylor won the Republican nomination and Judge Jennings resigned as chancellor and moved to Knoxville to practice law with the late T. Asbury Wright. The law firm was eminently successful. For many years, Judge Jennings had been the senior member of the law firm, Jennings, O'Neil and Jarvis. Congressman Taylor died November 14, 1939. Judge Jennings was chosen the Republican nominee and was elected to serve out the unexpired term of the 76th Congress, and was reelected to the 77th and to the 4 succeeding Congresses and served until January 3, 1951.

Born in Jacksboro, Campbell County, Tenn., on June 6, 1880, he attended the public schools and American Temperance University, Harriman, Tenn. He was graduated from the U. S. Grant University, Harriman, Tenn., in 1906, studied law, and was admitted to the bar of Tennessee in 1903. He began his practice of law in Jellico, Campbell County, Tenn.

Congressman Jennings was a distinguished lawyer, public servant and statesman.

On this occasion I should like to extend my genuine sympathy to his devoted wife and daughters, other members of his family, and to his thousands of friends, in their bereavement.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of John Jennings. During his period of service he and I developed a very close feeling of friendship, a friendship that I valued very much.

John Jennings was one of the hardest-working Members of the House, sincere in his devotion to his people, a man with a great love for our Government and its ideals and what it stands for. During his lifetime he made marked contributions toward the progress of America.

I shall miss him very much. He possessed one of the most dynamic, attractive personalities of any person I have ever met, a personality which impressed itself upon everyone who contacted him or knew him. I join my friends from Tennessee in expressing my deep sympathy to Mrs. Jennings and her loved ones.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret and profound sorrow that I heard of the death of my warm friend and former distinguished colleague from Tennessee, John Jennings. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout his period of service here and to admire and respect him and cherish a warm friendship with him. He was a man of outstanding ability, a man of the very highest character and demonstrated devotion to public service. I am sure he will be greatly missed by his great host of friends. I join my colleagues in conveying my deepest sympathy to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was very saddened the other day on reading in the press of the death of our former colleague, John Jennings. I served with John Jennings the many years he was in Congress. He was a very outstanding and able representative of the people of Tennessee.

John Jennings was an individual you could not help but like. He was genuine, he was real; I particularly liked the many times on social occasions when we could sit down with him and he would relate as only he could in his own fashion the many incidents of interest that took place during his life. I recall the many fine stories, which were actually

true stories, that depicted the character of this man and the kind of life he had led up to the time he came to Congress.

He was outstanding in many respects. His was a life of value and service to his community and Nation. Along with his many other friends still remaining in the Congress, I express my deep sympathy to those loved ones who remain.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in all my experience here I do not think I have seen a Member of Congress who was admired and respected more greatly than John Jennings, Jr. John Jennings came from an old pioneer family of east Tennessee. His sisters and his brothers have attained positions of high respectability in Tennessee. His brother has rendered eminent service in the Department of the Interior.

John Jennings started his career early. His rise was steady and rapid. He had a great capacity for love—no one enjoyed and loved people more than John Jennings. He derived a great deal of satisfaction out of his associations with people. I think aside from his achievements and his contributions to good government, which he made during his public life and while he was a Member of the Congress, the high satisfaction he got was out of his association with friends and fellow Members here on the floor. He had the qualities of heart and mind that appealed to the confidence of people. He was, I think, universally loved and certainly as universally respected as any man who has served in public life from Tennessee during my experience. The position which he achieved and the fine qualities of heart and mind which he exhibited will long stand as a monument to all who knew him. My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family and those who were dear to him back home in his State of Tennessee. We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that John Jennings lived a full life and made such fine contributions to good government and to society. The world is a better place because John Jennings passed this way.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege many years ago to know Judge Jennings before I came to the House. He was recognized as one of our great lawyers in Tennessee. After coming to the House, I served with him as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and no member of that great committee ever had greater respect from other members than did Judge Jennings. During his service here in the House, he made many, many friends on both sides of the aisle. Although, as has been stated, he was a stanch Republican, yet he could always see the point of view of Members who sat on the other side of the aisle. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague, and to express to the members of his family my deep sympathy for the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to hear of the death of Judge Jennings. I recall when he served here in the House with us; able, astute, a fine lawyer. I recall more vividly his sharp humor and, specifically, I am mindful of the occasion that must be recorded in the RECORD, when Judge Jennings asked to strike out the necessary number of words which automatically gave him 5 minutes on an amendment then under discussion. The judge was endeavoring to put forth, as he could in his very able and rapid manner, all of the sound arguments and reasons why that particular amendment should be adopted. But when a Member asked him to yield, he said, without hesitation, "I am sorry I cannot yield now since I am like a mummy, pressed for time." John Jennings continued his argument amid laughter and applause when the House caught on to his reply which impressed me further with this fine Tennessee gentleman. Others will remember this and other incidents that exemplified the ready wit, the great humor and human understanding and vast experience which he brought to his colleagues here in the House of Representatives. At times the debate becomes very serious and very heated, yet there is always one, like Judge Jennings, who could by his gentle humor, restored the necessary coolness so necessary to the proper deliberations of this body. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and especially our colleagues from the State of Tennessee in extending condolences to the family of Judge Jennings.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI INTERPOSES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, by a vote of 136 to none in the House and 49 to none in the Senate, the Legislature of the State of Mississippi joined those of her sister States of Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, in interposing her sovereignty between the illegal black Monday decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the people of her States. This resolution, in effect states that Mississippi will not abide by these decisions, and declares them invalid and of no force and effect within the territorial jurisdiction of Mississippi. We do not intend to submit to the tyranny of a political Supreme Court. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of this resolution, and I commend it to the reading of the House. The resolution is self-explanatory, and reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 125

Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and preemptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from the compact, to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long-recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

That the Legislature of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, but only specific sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over its schools, colleges, educational and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulations, and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to

subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgements of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has enabled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solemnly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi for its part asserts that it and its sister States have never delegated such rights;

That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it;

That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Government attemps to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

Resolved, That in order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered;

The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it to be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States;

The compact intended ours to be a government of the people, for the people and, above all, a government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a central government;

The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under Article 5 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we do hereby declare the decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi;

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States.

The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of each of the other States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WINSTEAD. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any of the Members of the House of Representatives is surprised at the interposition resolution of our Mississippi Legislature.

I would like to say to the membership of the House that this resolution represents the deep feelings of our people in Mississippi. We feel very strongly that the Supreme Court in the school decisions warped the meaning of the Constitution. We believe that the Court, in effect, amended the Constitution.

We know that in our State, where the two races have lived together in harmony for many, many years, that the overwhelming majority of both races believe in segregation.

We know, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has made the situation worse for all parties concerned.

I am glad to note that the Legislature of Mississippi, by unanimous vote, has let the Supreme Court and the people of the Nation know just how we feel about this act of the Supreme Court which strikes at the very foundation of our Government.

If the Supreme Court can usurp this right of the States, then there is no other right that would be beyond its reach.

THE SOIL BANK PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement of Melvin P. Gehlbach.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting with my remarks the statement of Melvin P. Gehlbach, chairman of the Soil Bank Association of Lincoln, Ill., before the House Committee on Agriculture Tuesday, February 28, 1956.

Melvin Gehlbach was the originator of the soil bank plan and is a resident of my congressional district. He has been one of the most careful thinkers on agricultural problems of anyone in America.

I have been disturbed by the so-called soil bank provisions of S. 3183, which is far from the real soil bank plan as originated some years ago by Mr. Gehlbach. Many of my colleagues have asked me about Mr. Gehlbach and his plan. May I recommend to all of you a careful reading of the statement which Mr. Gehlbach made before the House Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday. It is a complete and careful analysis of the real soil bank plan. Unless the Senate bill is amended to comply substantially with the Gehlbach plan, the soil bank plan will not be able to work substantially as it was planned.

I realize that the bill which will come to this House for a vote will be written in the conference between the House and

the other body on the bill passed last year by the House and the bill that will be enacted by the other body this week.

To the conferees I am recommending that they most carefully consider Mr. Gehlbach's testimony and a true understanding had of his plan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gehlbach's statement be inserted in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN P. GEHLBACH, CHAIRMAN, SOIL-BANK ASSOCIATION, LINCOLN, ILL., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 28, 1956

On behalf of the Soil-Bank Association I would like to express our appreciation for having this opportunity to reappear before your committee. My first testimony concerning the soil-bank approach was at the public hearing of the House Committee on Agriculture, at Bloomington, Ill., on October 17, 1953. At this time we outlined an agricultural program based on conservation incentives and unrestricted acreages of basic crops. We presented the soil-bank plan for American agriculture to this committee on April 15, 1954.

I am representing the Soil-Bank Association which was incorported to promote the original soil-bank plan. I am not representing any State or National Farm Bureau organization.

In recent months proposals of many varieties have been echoed across the country under the name of soil bank. With so many different proposals under the same name it is only natural that farmers and the general public are confused. We didn't copyright the name—maybe we should have. We were more interested in developing a workable plan. And, we still believe that the original proposal is a more workable plan.

In our opinion, the real solution to our agricultural problem does not hinge on the much debated issue of price support level. In our testimony before this committee on April 15, 1954, we stated, "Lowering farm support prices is not the solution to our agricultural problem. Lower prices require greater acreage to maintain net earnings. Farmers must be assured fair earnings in relation to other segments of the economy. This is vital. We feel that the soundest solution to the agricultural problem is to financially encourage an increased acreage of soil-building crops so that farmers will voluntarily adjust production in relation to demand."

The farm problem is more than Government-held farm surpluses. It is primarily that of protecting the net earnings of individual farmers throughout all areas of the country. Not to guarantee them a profit—but only to give them an opportunity to share fairly in the prosperity enjoyed by other segments of the economy.

Farm prices go down, you know, when we produce more than current market needs. The sad story is that farm prices go down faster than production increases. It is generally accepted that a 10 percent increase in the supply of grain is associated with a 20 percent decline in price. For livestock, a 10 percent increase in supply is associated with a 25 percent decline in price. The soil-bank plan is founded on the principle that farmers in all areas must realize that they cannot continue to overproduce market needs, depress farm prices lower and lower, and expect to end up with a fair net earning. This is especially true when farm operating costs remain high.

Allow me to again quote from my previous statement before this committee: "By properly placing incentive payments on soil-building crops we could encourage farmers to produce what is needed for current consumption, maintain farm earnings at full parity, and store fertility in the soil to be a ready reserve of productive capacity for food and fiber in any emergency. In this way we would protect our agricultural resources for future generations as well as our current farm earnings. The adjustment of our acres between soil-building and soil-depletive uses on each and every farm is the ultimate answer to our agricultural problem. More and more people are seeing the soundness of this approach."

Farmers of all agriculture areas need to cooperate in an overall adjustment of production. To give all farmers the benefit of a sound agricultural program we must adjust the diverted acres as well as the acres of our basic crops. Reducing the acreage of a crop in one agricultural region and having the acreage for that same crop expanded in another region is mere nonsense. Reducing the acreage of an individual crop in all areas merely to have it replaced by a substitute crop—a crop second best for the region—is also nonsense.

We must think beyond the production of crops in the development of a program. We must also include the livestock producer in order to protect his net income. An oversupply of feed or the untimely release of Government-held surplus at a low price could spell disaster to the livestock farmer since a 10 percent increase in supply brings a 25 percent decline in his prices.

THE SOIL-BANK ASSOCIATION PROPOSAL

The implementation of a farm program to adjust production in keeping with the soil-bank principles must be direct, simple, and extensive. We feel it should have a positive approach and should offer to farmers the opportunity to earn an incentive payment to expand his soil-building acres over and above a normal minimum base. This base should relate to the level of soil resources in the area. The incentive payment should outweigh the difference between the fertility value of such additional acres and the farmer's sacrifice of current income which he would forego by making this adjustment. Our proposal was never intended to unload Government-held surpluses onto the farmer or onto the market, but instead, to effectively adjust production below current needs to make use of present held surpluses at their full value. Surpluses are a result of overproduction in relation to market needs and their cure, if not forthcoming through markets, must come from the production side.

EXPANDED SOIL BUILDING CAN ADJUST ALL PRODUCTION

The adjustment of agricultural production would be accomplished by our being concerned with the acreage of only one class of crops—the soil-building crops. As these crops are expanded, the acreages of cash crops in surplus are reduced. An effective soil-bank plan can be just this simple. This approach could then successfully handle the diverted acres problem. It would prevent the substitution of similar crops competing with price-supported crops.

If we are going to face the issue squarely, the Corn Belt will need to adjust the production of all feed grains instead of only corn; a portion of the diverted wheat acreage now planted to feed grains will need to be in soil building; and, in the Cotton Belt a portion of the corn and soybean acres will need to be in soil building. Corn farmers need to realize that planting soybeans in lieu of corn is not an effective production adjustment program. If we choose not to face this issue squarely, the American farmer, guided by the economics of his individual farm business, may continue to overproduce only to receive lower and lower prices.

In the United States we have 142 million acres of cropland planted to hay and pasture. We also have about 30 million acres temporarily idle or land in soil improvement crops not harvested or pastured; in addition there are 24 million acres of land summer fallow and not producing a crop. We doubt the effectiveness of a program that would allow farmers to place into an acreage reserve the 54 million acres that are already retired from crop production. Are we going to reduce surplus if we merely pay farmers to place acres they are not now using for crops into an acreage or conservation reserve?

We are hopeful that title II, Soil Bank Act, of Senate bill 3183 can be amended to prevent normal summer fallow land from becoming the acreage reserve while the underplanted wheat acreage might still be diverted to the production of feed grains. We also hope that the underplanted allotted acreage of corn placed in the acreage reserve will not have as its soil conserving crop any of the present acreage now in soil improvement crops not harvested or pastured. If this were true, the reduced corn acreage may be diverted to soybeans. The farmer in noncompliance would increase corn and reduce soybeans. We believe that the acreage reserve as proposed will be ineffective in adjusting production in the Corn Belt. Only a small portion of farmers in this area would be eligible under the acreage reserve program since 60 percent of corn farmers are not in compliance with acreage allotments. A lower support price on corn together with a reduced allotment for corn, is not inducive to greater participation for cornbelt farmers.

Our hope is that the hour is not too late to get a changed approach in the implementation of the Soil Bank Act, with particular reference to subtitle A, acreage reserve program. Instead of the acreage reserve being limited to the underplanting of allotment crops, farmers should be given opportunity to expand the acreage of soil-building crops in excess of a minimum base.

The soil-bank plan as proposed by the Soil Bank Association would—

1. Establish a minimum base for hay, pasture, and soil-building crops for the various agricultural regions.

2. Offer incentive payments, for soil-building acres in excess of this minimum base.

3. Establish the soil-building base for an individual farm in relation to soil class, and it would not be tied to an individual farmer's historical acreage.

4. Give all individual farms on comparable land classes a comparable proportionate base and give opportunity to earn soil-bank incentive payments for an additional acreage of soil-building crops.

5. Provide incentive payments, that relate to the value of crops harvested per acre of cropland, to outweigh net profits and not gross profits per acre.

6. Allow level, highly productive land to receive higher incentive payments on fewer acres, while rolling and less productive land would receive somewhat lower per acre payments, but on more acres.

7. Provide commodity loans at levels adjusted to the degree of soil-building compliance on individual farms.

APPLICATION TO A FARM

The degree of success of any farm program, will depend, to a large extent, upon how it will operate on an individual farm. Let us compare the proposed acreage reserve and our soil-bank plan on a typical farm in the Corn Belt. In order to properly evaluate the application of a program, one must start with the crops grown during the year previous to the application of the plan. The following is a list of the fields and crops grown in 1955:

1. Fifty acres: Alfalfa.

2. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

3. Fifty acres: Corn.

4. Fifty acres: 30 acres corn, 20 acres soybeans.

Land use summary

	Acres
Corn	80
Soybeans	20
Small grain	50
Total grain	150
Hay and pasture	50
Total crop acres	200

THE ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

If we apply the proposed acreage reserve program to this 200-acre farm, I think we could expect the 1956 farm map to show as large a grain acreage as the 1955 production. In the Senate bill 3183 we do not see any provision to prevent a farmer from placing some of his present hay and pasture acreage into the acreage reserve to equal the underplanted corn acreage. After doing this he can plant the 30 acres formerly in corn into soybeans and the result is merely a shifting of crops. His continuing to have 150 acres in grain together with certificates to secure additional feed grains out of CCC stocks for the 30 acres of underplanted corn will result in a greater supply available for feed or market. The result of this can only be further depressed livestock and grain prices. Acreage reserve payments received by farmers would be offset by lower prices resulting from the failure of the program to adjust production and the untimely release of Government held surpluses.

1. Fifty acres: Corn.

2. Fifty acres: 20 acres alfalfa hay and pasture, 30 acres alfalfa acreage reserve.

3. Fifty acres: Soybeans.

4. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

Acreage reserve program—land use summary

	Acres
Corn	50
Soybeans	50
Small grain	50
Total grain	150
Hay and pasture	20
Acreage reserve	30
Total crop acres	200

The soil-bank plan, designed to pay farmers to keep additional land in soil-building crops over and above a normal minimum base of hay and pasture crops, would adjust the acreage of grain crops downward. The crops planted, as in the acreage reserve program, must follow a rather definite rotation sequence. Field 1 would normally be planted to corn. Field 2, which was in small grain in 1955, naturally will be the alfalfa hay and pasture in 1956. Field 3 might well be corn or soybeans. Field 4 would go into small grain with a seeding of alfalfa to be used the following year.

1. Fifty acres: 20 acres corn, 30 acres alfalfa soil-bank.

2. Fifty acres: Alfalfa hay and pasture.

3. Fifty acres: 30 acres corn, 20 acres soybeans.

4. Fifty acres: Small grain (legume seeding).

Our soil-bank plan—land use summary

	Acres
Corn	50
Soybeans	20
Small grain	50
Total grain	120
Hay and pasture	50
Soil-bank acres	30
Total crop acres	200

Assuming a minimum hay and pasture base of 25 percent of the cropland, this particular farmer could comply with the soil bank by allowing possibly 30 acres of alfalfa to remain in field 1 and reduce his acreage of grain from 150 acres to 120 acres. He would not upset his livestock operations by having restrictions placed on his normal use of hay and pasture.

Prior to the application of the soil-bank plan, the grain of this farm would be produced on 150 acres of cropland. After 30 acres are shifted from grain to soil-building uses, grain production will be limited to 120 acres. Assuming a yield of 50 bushels of grain per acre we would have a total production of 7,500 bushels prior to the soil-bank program.

The summary of production both before and after the soil-bank plan would be as follows:

Normal production:	
Acres	150
Yield (bushels per acre)	50
Production (bushels)	7,500
Price	$1.00
Gross return	$7,500
Probable reduction:	
Acres	30
Yield (bushels per acre)	40
Production (bushels)	1,200
Adjusted production:	
Acres	120
Yield (bushels per acre)	52.5
Production (bushels)	6,300
Price	$1.32
Gross return	$8,316

Percent change, 20 percent fewer acres; 16 percent adjustment in production.

How does the soil-bank plan affect the individual farmer's earning?

1. By removing 30 acres from production, the farmer can save the cost of plowing, planting, cultivating, harvesting, fertilizer, and seed for the soil-bank acres.

2. He increases his average yield by taking out his lowest yielding acres.

3. His 16-percent reduction in production is associated with a 32 percent increase in price. His gross earning would compare as follows:

7,500 bushels at $1 per bushel	$7,500
6,300 bushels at $1.32 per bushel	8,316
Increase in gross return under soil-bank plan	816
Soil-bank payment (30 acres at $30 per acre)	900
Added gross return for compliance with soil bank	1,716

THE LIVESTOCK FARMER IS PROTECTED

Incentive payments should be designed so as to discourage overproduction of roughage-consuming livestock. For example, a farmer expanding his acreage of soil-building crops and using these crops for feed would be given only a first payment. If this acreage were used solely as fertility, he would be given a fertility reserve payment in addition to the first payment. A most successful way to direct America is the use of the American dollar. You can legislate laws forbidding the use for forage acres for hay and pasture, but who will drive the cows out of the forbidden area at midnight? It would seem much easier to pay for the shift in land use after the shift is made and finally make the fertility reserve payment only if the forage were not fed.

The dairy cows eating this extra forage will have to show promise of a substantial profit or a farmer may send them to market and take his dollar incentive payment today rather than milk cows and hope for a profit tomorrow. Feeder cattle profits, as well as net returns from beef cow herds, will have to be attractive before farmers will forego their final fertility reserve payment. The soil-bank plan is designated for livestock farms as well as grain farms.

FEED RESERVE FOR EMERGENCY

The increased acres of soil-building crops are more than a fertility reserve—they are a forage reserve on each and every farm. In case of drought or other emergency, this reserve can be brought into use if need outweighs incentive payment. The decision to release much needed feed to maintain cattle herds when drought, flood, or insect hazards strike, should be left with the farmer. The forage reserve is designed to meet the needs of the individual farm and have a degree of flexibility to protect farm income as well as a food supply for the Nation.

SURPLUS RELEASE CREATES PRICE PROBLEM

Now we would like to take up the handling of present surpluses. It is very important that these surpluses not be brought back onto farms or into the market until we have an effective production-adjustment program. If farmers are paid certificates that would release Government surpluses, while at the same time they merely shift crop acreages instead of reducing overall production, we might find farm market prices going to even lower levels. The quickest way to defeat the real operation of a soil bank is to have these Government surpluses at reduced prices become the soil-bank payment for land shifted but not reducing production.

TO HANDLE SURPLUS

How must we handle our Government-held surpluses? We believe we should—

1. Convert a portion of present farm surplus into a well-defined stockpile with provision for periodic replacement. This should be spelled out for national defense or emergency and not considered a surplus.

2. Adjust production below current needs to absorb the balance of the surplus into the market for use as soon as possible, not at reduced price but at full price. We are in accord with the President's proposal to "recommend legislation to permit, under proper safeguards, sales at not less than support levels, plus carrying charges."

3. Instead of taking a substantial loss on the billions of dollars of agricultural commodities held by the Government, use a part of this money for an effective soil-bank program to adjust production below current needs. Nearly everyone agrees that it is cheaper to pay a farmer an incentive to expand soil-building acres than to overproduce cash crops and have to wonder what to do with them. In addition, the farmer receives extra earning in that he saves the cost of producing the surplus.

COMPLIANCE

It may be difficult to obtain full voluntary compliance in the soil-bank or any other plan in the near future. Farmers' participation would be determined largely by their attitude toward past programs as well as present programs. As some farmers might find it advantageous not to cooperate, many farmers may wish to shift beyond their allotted soil-building acreage and receive the unused soil-bank funds available from those who think it would be better to forego payment and not adjust production. In this way we may have only two-thirds of the farmers participating but acrewise could attain effective compliance. Why not let those farmers who need it most, adjust production and build fertility?

In addition to the incentive payment inducing farmers to adjust production, we propose offering commodity loans at levels in relation to the compliance with soil-bank acres. Farmers in full compliance should be eligible for full loan value. Farmers planting all cash crops and no soil-building crops would be eligible for only 50 percent loan value. The farmer determines his own loan level by his degree of participation in production adjustment.

IMPLEMENTATION

The proposed soil-bank plan must be made effective beyond any normal program to protect price levels during the period of moving surplus stocks back into the market for consumption. An accelerated program to accomplish this would involve a vigorous approach for 2 or 3 years and then would be tempered, not ended, to keep agriculture in balance with the rest of the economy.

The money spent for incentive payments to adjust production should not be considered a direct cost to the Government, for these payments would yield returns; first, by raising the price level of Government-held stocks in addition to farm prices; and, second, reduce losses now inevitable on the vast holding of commodities deteriorating in value due to loss of quality, as well as save on the million-dollar-a-day storage cost.

We would recommend that our soil-bank plan be implemented at an early date to halt the farm price decline, reduce the cost of storing unwanted surpluses, and move commodities now held, into the market at a much earlier date than would be accomplished in a program involving only 45 million ineffective acres, acres that are already out of crop production.

Our soil-bank plan would be applied as follows:

Approximate acres (millions)

Total acres of cropland in the United States	478
Soil-building base (large part of present acreage in hay, pasture, etc.)	150
Soil-bank acres (for which farmers can receive incentive payments)	150

It can never be expected that all acreage eligible for payment will be shifted into soil-building, but we can expect near 100 million acres of land now producing cash crops at a low yield per acre and returning little or no net profit per acre to come into the soil-bank program. When surpluses are reduced and production is brought into line with market needs, the higher price will automatically shift land back into cash crops thus relieving the Governemnt of providing as much incentive payment. This plan is designed to balance agriculture with the level of the entire economy, protecting the consumer's food supply at reasonable prices; while, on the other hand, protecting the farmer against the plague of overproduction, unwanted surpluses and drastically low farm earnings.

We would like to see soil-bank payments made in two parts—a first payment to shift land use from grain to forage on the expected 100 million acres at an average payment of $8 per acre. This payment would be related to the level of production of the various agricultural regions ranging from $3 to $15 per acre. There should be no restrictions on the use of forage for this first payment. A second payment would be offered those farmers who forego feeding the forage on these soil-bank acres. This payment too would average around $8 per acre with a range similar to the first payment. A good guess is that we would have at least 75 million acres of the 100 million acres affected by the second incentive payment to place into a fertility reserve the forage grown and not harvested or fed. These payments should be enlarged for the first year or two in order to assure greater compliance. This is necessary to bring production into balance with market needs, use our accumulated surplus and protect the net earning of farmers during the period of adjustment.

SOIL-BANK PLAN CAN EARN ITS OWN WAY

By adjusting production beyond current needs, enabling the Government to move the surplus into the market earlier, and thereby saving the cost of commodity deterioration and storage, we should regain $600 million. This is based on a $6 billion storage holding, figuring a 10 percent annual reduction in value.

By adjusting production to market needs, we might well halt the farm price decline and even regain a part of the 25-percent decrease already experienced. A 10-percent reduction in production is associated with a 20-percent increase in grain prices and a 25-percent increase in livestock prices. It is quite possible to gain this much in 1 year if present surpluses are properly handled.

A quite conservative estimate of price response to an effective program of production adjustment would be at least 10 percent. If this is applied to only $6 billion of present Government stockpile, the program could earn about $600 million without using the surplus itself.

These 2 factors alone, the gaining of price and the prevention of part of the loss of commodity deterioration and storage costs, would provide $1.2 billion toward incentive payments proposed.

For the portion of farmers having earnings at levels subject to Federal income tax, the increase in earnings resulting from the program will pay all or at least a substantial part of the cost of administering the program.

NET COST

How much money will this program cost? If made effective it need not cost too much. Here are our estimates:

Payments

	Million dollars
First payment—100 million acres to forage at $8	800
Second payment—75 million acres (forage not fed) at $8	600
Total incentive payments (spending—not cost)	1,400

Soil-bank earnings

Price recovery of CCC inventory and reduction of losses (deterioration)	1,200
Net cost	200

We hope that legislation can provide farmers with the means to adjust production. When this is accomplished we will have solved the farm surplus problem. The adjustment of production in all agricultural areas is the solution to the real farm problem. An aggressive soil-bank program to adjust production to market needs and bring farm prices to full parity in the market will answer the much debated question of farm price support levels.

Thank you.

FEDERAL AIRPORT AID PROGRAM

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that yesterday the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee by unanimous action agreed to undertake an investigation of the Federal airport aid program. I urged such an investigation in a letter to the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman of the subcommittee, which I inserted in my remarks concerning Federal airport aid on the floor of the House last Thursday appearing on page 3266 and following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In announcing the committee's action the chairman issued a brief statement indicating the purpose and scope of the committee's inquiry, which I insert at this point in my remarks.

[From the office of Representative ROBERT MOLLOHAN, February 29, 1956]

Representative ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, disclosed today a subcommittee he heads will investigate Federal airport-aid allocations administered by the Commerce Department.

MOLLOHAN, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, said his inquiry stemmed from charges of waste in allocations to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport at Romulus, Mich.

The inquiry was asked by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, a member of MOLLOHAN'S subcommittee.

MOLLOHAN said the current Federal Airport Aid Act granting broad powers and huge amounts of money to the Civil Aeronautics Administration made it imperative that Congress maintain a check to see that it is spent economically and efficiently.

MOLLOHAN'S subcommittee monitors executive expenditures in the Commerce Department as well as the Treasury and Justice Departments and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The West Virginia lawmaker said a new airport-aid act, passed last year, binds Congress to appropriate more than $250 million for the next 4 years for United States airport development. He said his panel will try to determine whether the Commerce Department and the Civil Aeronautics Administration are building airports for the horse and buggy reciprocal-engine era, or for the vast new turbo-prop and jet age.

MOLLOHAN said he also wants to determine the extent to which the armed services, through their membership on the Air Coordinating Committee and its panels, dominates determination of civil-aviation policy.

Mr. Speaker, this prospective investigation of the Federal airport-aid program, and particularly expenditures of funds at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, have aroused a great deal of interest in the State of Michigan. The Ann Arbor News on February 27 commented favorably on the proposed inquiry in an editorial which reads as follows:

FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW—MEADER SEEKS SHOWDOWN ON WILLOW RUN DISPUTE

Representative GEORGE MEADER, vigorous champion of Willow Run in the airport fracas, has suggested a full-scale investigation in the Federal airport air program.

And the developments in the past 6 months seem to warrant one. MEADER cited the Civil Aeronautics Administration's recent allotment of $975,000 to the Wayne Major Airport as a "prime example of unconscionable waste of public funds."

The CAA made the allotment on the basis of a recommendation made by the airport use panel that the commercial airlines located at Willow Run move to Wayne Major Airport and that military air operations be concentrated at Willow Run. The appropriation by the CAA is understandable, therefore, but the air panel's recommendation in the fall has stumped almost everyone.

It is perfectly apparent even to the strongest partisans of Willow Run or Wayne Major that neither port fulfills the air requirements of the Detroit metropolitan area. A new airport to the northeast of Detroit is the ultimate answer to problems of expanded air usage. To spend huge sums of money on either other airport would be a manifest mistake. And Wayne Major can

be made acceptable for the airlines now located at Willow Run only at the expenditure of many millions of dollars. One of the airlines now located at Willow Run has indicated a willingness to move, but the spokesman for all the others has said it would be "bad business judgment" for them to consider such a thing and they will not move unless forced to.

The air panel has no power to enforce its mysterious recommendation, but the Government has requested that the university, to which the airport is leased, try the panel recommendations. President Hatcher's reply delivered to the Navy Department last week stated, however, that the university did not consider the recommendation any reason for "rescinding existing commitments to the airlines."

Last fall's panel report contains plenty of ammunition for Representative MEADER in his call for an investigation. The report shows that less than half a million dollars have been spent for improvements on Willow Run Airport—of which about $70,000 is Federal money—in recent years. Wayne Major on the other hand has received $4 million of Federal money and $13 million of county money. All this has been poured into what at best would be a stop-gap airport and isn't even that at present.

Improvements are necessary at Willow Run, but the airlines say they can finance them without any Federal aid.

MEADER has made renewed appeals for reconsideration to Louis S. Rothschild, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and Charles G. Lowen, CAA Administrator, neither of whom held office when the air use recommendation was made last fall. To date, he has received no assurance from them that the CAA allocation will be held up, or that the total situation will be reviewed.

If he receives no satisfaction on his requests for a new assessment, MEADER will have every reason to suspect that such misuse of Government money is not uncommon. A full-scale investigation is certainly indicated if the Government persists in its determination to send good money after bad.

The Detroit Free Press has exhibited a sustained interest in Detroit's airport problems and ran a series of 13 articles by their aviation writer, Jean Pearson, which I inserted in the remarks I made last Thursday.

On February 25 the Detroit Free Press also endorsed the objectives of the investigation I have requested in an editorial which reads as follows:

MEADER'S WISH TO LOOK AT AIRPORT SPENDING

Since World War II, Willow Run has been Detroit's commercial airport.

Except from local politicians, there has been no pressure to move the airlines to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. In the main the lines have rejected invitations to go there.

While air travelers think gloomily of the miles and minutes they must travel after passing Wayne Major to reach Willow Run, there has been no ground swell of public effort toward moving commercial operations. We certainly have heard of no petitions urging it.

Yet Federal money has continued to go into Wayne Major. What the county and State elect to do with their money is another matter. But when Federal money is spent for airport development it is supposed to be done in accordance with certain rules and to meet particular needs.

For that reason we think that there is point to Representative MEADER'S call for a congressional investigation of what he calls an unconscionable waste of public funds. Unless it can explain its actions on a basis of military desirability, we're of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Authority may have some difficulty justifying its Wayne-Major outlays.

Fortifying this opinion are matters dealt with in the 13 airport articles by our aviation writer, Jean Pearson, which the Free Press published. These articles, indeed, sparked MEADER'S request for investigation and were inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mayor Cobo, while welcoming Meader's proposed inquiry, says he thinks Congress should have a look at Willow Run's books, too. If there is any ground for thinking that the University of Michigan has indulged in chicanery in its handling of Willow Run, his recommendation certainly should be pursued.

From surface indications, however, we would say that there is more that is questionable to be discovered at Wayne Major than at Willow Run. We don't believe it is good public policy for the CAA to have spent money on developing a field only a few miles from a going commercial airport when we so badly need an air terminal better situated than either Willow Run or Wayne Major to serve Detroit and a great many of the communities with which it is ringed about.

I also insert at this point the following telegram from William E. Brown, Jr., mayor of the city of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *March 1, 1956.*

Congressman GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend you highly for your vigorous investigation of airport expenditures. There is no sound reason, in my opinion, why Wayne Airport should be developed in view of the fact that Northeast Airport in city of Detroit is almost assured. Our district, I am sure, appreciates your active interest in our behalf.

WILLIAM E. BROWN, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Ann Arbor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of our Legal and Monetory Affairs Subcommittee, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, Representative MOLLOHAN, and my other colleagues on the committee for the forthright manner in which they have undertaken this very important inquiry. I want to commend especially the committee's intention to look into the airport aid program from the point of view of the national interest in the future of aviation.

The committee's inquiry is not limited to the controversy over airports in the Detroit area but seeks to assess the competence of decisions made in fostering and developing airports in the light of the rapid expansion of aviation and the prospective employment of improved planes and aviation techniques and their relationship to the location and design of airports.

I also commend the chairman's statement that he seeks to appraise the part the military have played in the decisions in the executive branch of the Government on aviation problems and whether that participation has been in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have high hopes that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee can make a real contribution to the future of aviation through the inquiry it has today undertaken.

NEW ENGLAND BUSINESS GROUP ASKS FOR TAX RELIEF IN THE PATMAN BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee met this morning with the Smaller Business Association of New England and heard a group of New England accounting and tax experts analyze several tax measures now pending in Congress. At the conclusion of its presentation, the New England business group, through its president, went on record as favoring the provisions of H. R. 9067, introduced by me, although other Members are coauthors, and pledged to support its passage.

Mr. Daniel F. Viles, president of the association, in an opening statement said:

We are prepared to show you by the actual 5-year balance sheets of 7 different companies that tax relief for small concerns is urgently needed. Many bills for small business tax relief have been introduced. However the Patman bill, H. R. 9067, seems to be the best thought out, to be supported by the most intensive research, and to offer the best relief. We favor its provisions, as those which are adequate to insure the health and growth of small business, which is so necessary to maximum employment. The alarming number of mergers of small concerns with large firms is already a matter of deep concern to Congress, as indicated by the many bills introduced to regulate and restrict such mergers.

Mr. Viles also said:

The chairman of this Committee, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, has earned again the high esteem in which he is held by small and independent businessmen in all parts of the United States. The investigations and studies of the House Small Business Committee during the past year, and particularly those which have led to the drafting of the Patman tax bill, show a profound understanding of the economic influences which are bringing about a changing status of small business. I am grateful that the work of this Committee is awakening the Congress and the Nation to the steps which must be taken to preserve an opportunity for small business, and an opportunity for the growth of small business, in our free enterprise economy.

I was glad to praise the aggressive leadership of the Smaller Business Association of New England under Mr. Viles and said:

I am frank to say that while we had heard complaints about small business taxes, it was the New England Smaller Business Association that first dramatized to the Committee, more than a year ago, the necessity for adjusting the business taxes to give small and medium size firms more equitable treatment. The drafting of H. R. 9067 resulted from the request which your splendid association put before this Committee last year. It is generally agreed that it would be unwise to reduce Federal revenues at this time and I have therefore introduced a bill which will retain the present level of revenues but graduate the tax rate so that small and medium size firms will receive a substantial tax cut, while the largest firms—those most able to pay—will pay somewhat higher rates. Such a measure as this is immediately needed to encourage a general expansion of business, not only to provide attractive jobs for children now growing up on the farm, but to increase production of those goods and services which are relatively scarce and high priced.

You may be sure that I will do everything possible to help pass this bill.

Mr. Henry F. Griswold, a lawyer and certified public accountant of Boston, gave screen slide demonstrations analyzing the effects of present tax rates on the growth prospects of a number of smaller firms among his clients.

Mr. Archibald Peisch, a certified public accountant from Vermont, and former professor at the Amos Tuck Business School of Dartmouth College, testified that "among his smaller business clients, the application of the surtax after $25,000, of earnings has brought over 30 concerns to the brink of disaster."

ITALY

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to welcome into our midst yesterday the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi. I know the membership was highly impressed with the fine speech delivered by the President. A fluent speaker, he is clearly a man of intellect and integrity. He is eager to maintain the friendly spirit and cooperation between our two countries, and is proving himself an able representative of the great Republic of Italy.

Events in the past few years have proved in the most convincing manner that the friendship between Italy and the United States is one of the most vital partnerships in the free world. The cornerstone of Italy's foreign policy is the Atlantic Alliance. Her leaders, by signing the Atlantic Pact on April 4, 1949, pledged their country to place all her moral and material resources at the service of the common cause of the Western democracies. This decision was not an easy one for Italy, for she was still facing a long uphill fight both for material reconstruction and for moral recovery from the destruction of the war. Italy has made tremendous progress since that time—the Government is now devoting increasing attention to all aspects of the country's defense. Her army is well equipped, well organized and trained, and has an extremely high morale. The military task of Italy's forces is carried out within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance and Western European Union. Her participation is of paramount importance as it represents a strong territorial support for the West European group and at the same time provides essential air and naval action in the Mediterranean.

The same spirit of cooperation with the West which led Italy to join the North Atlantic Treaty countries, has also made her a vigorous and active leader in the programs for European cooperation and integration. A strong member of the OEEC, the Council of Europe and the Coal and Steel Community, Italy was one of the first signatories to ratify the recent Paris Agreements, establishing the Western European Union. Italy's allies are confident of full Italian cooperation in perfecting this organization and promoting its growth.

As President Gronchi made clear in his speech, few countries in Europe are more aware than Italy of the need for integration—both economically and militarily. At the same time, few countries have had to struggle against the enormous internal problems with which this country has been constantly faced. Certainly not the least of these problems has been the alarming strength of the Communist and leftist parties. Italy's leaders have been vigorous in their fight against this menace; and in recent years, with a substantial improvement in the economic picture, there has been no great gain made by the Communists.

Italy's large population has presented that country with a serious problem of unemployment. Since the end of World War II, the Government has worked unceasingly toward the solution of this problem. Special attention is now being given to three categories of activities, designed to alleviate unemployment. The first of these is agriculture, where modern scientific methods are being encouraged; the second is the development of public utility services; and the third is public works and here extensive work is now being carried on.

The favorable results of this program are already reflected in the land reform program. Italy's economy is fundamentally bound up with agriculture. Out of a working population of about 19 million, 8½ million are employed in agriculture. So that Italy's plan for development of the land through reclamation and irrigation works has resulted in considerable improvement in living conditions and repercussions are being felt directly or indirectly in all branches of the national economy. Our own country is gratified that through the Marshall plan we have had a part in helping Italy to make a new start. Yet the main effort has come from the ingenious and hard-working people of Italy and their leaders. The millions of Americans of Italian origin have given us all an awareness of the admirable qualities of these people from southern Europe. The Government of Italy will continue to have the encouragement and help of our country as it moves to extend land reform and other measures to promote economic well-being. President Gronchi pointed out that "freedom becomes a sham and a privilege for those who are already strong, unless it means to every man and woman freedom from the hardships of poverty and starvation."

The United States hopes to extend its partnership with Italy in many ways as it becomes more and more imperative for the Western democracies to draw together. There is certainly a promising outlook in the whole realm of economic and cultural cooperation between our two countries. As the President declared, "Italy can be trusted, because of the capacity and willingness to work of their managers, technicians and labor, and also because of her faithfulness to democratic ideals and her firm determination to defend and expand their accomplishments."

I know that yesterday as we in this body extended our warmest welcome to President Gronchi, we joined with the people of the United States in an affectionate regard and high esteem for this man and his country.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. DINGELL. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly apparent that the Soviet bloc has undertaken a campaign of economic subversion of the free world. This Communist strategy is aimed at breaking down the ties of mutual economic interest that bind the United States and its partners in the free world community. Its technique is to use the lure of trade offers to woo away commerce that is presently directed to the free world trading system. By so doing, the Soviets hope to break down the economic interdependence and, hence, the political interdependence of the community of democratic nations.

One clear and obvious solution presents itself: We must reaffirm our own traditional policy of lowering the barriers to trade among the free nations. By doing so, we would offer a durable and lasting solution to the fly-by-night, politically inspired trade threats and entreaties of the Soviet.

But, Mr. Speaker, have we responded with vigor? Have we drawn our inspiration from our traditional policies and forged ahead? Absolutely not. All about us are raised the timorous voices of fear and isolation. These voices are loud in the administration itself. The counsels that are proclaimed the loudest are those of men who shout that we are weak, that we are vulnerable, that we must shun our allies and confine our minds and activities to the ever-narrowing shell of our own continent. Indeed, the Tariff Commission is now packed with high tariff advocates.

Mr. Speaker, such an attitude ill-becomes a great and powerful nation that is the recognized leader of the free world. We are in the middle of the 20th century. And try as they may, the trade restrictionists will never be able to drag us back into the 18th century. The responsibilities of the 20th century call for the expansion of trade and not for its contraction; for increased trade cooperation, not isolation and trade warfare; for initiative, not feet-dragging in freeing trade. These are our responsibilities. But the proper exercise of our responsibilities will offer, as in the past, the promise of great rewards. For no other country in the world has as much to gain as the United States.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the United States can, therefore, adopt no other course than to reaffirm and reinvigorate its traditional policy that is embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program and in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. For, it was with

enduring wisdom that Cordell Hull conceived the idea of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program. As a former member of this House, Cordell Hull had vast experience with congressional writing of detailed tariff laws. He witnessed the legislative nightmare of 1929–30 that produced the Smoot-Hawley tariff. When he became Secretary of State under Franklin D. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull conceived the idea of entering into trade agreements with friendly countries for the purpose of engaging in reciprocal tariff reductions to the mutual benefit of both countries concerned.

First enacted in 1934, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been extended 10 times by the Congress, a fact which is itself testimony to the durable values of expanding world trade by lowering the barriers to such trade.

The reciprocal trade idea was, and is, based on the enduring and irrefutable logic that "trade is a two-way street." This familiar metaphor expresses two truths: First, the gains and benefits from world trade are reciprocal; we gain in exports and in the supply of needed imports as other countries benefit from their trade with us. Second, we cannot continue to export unless we continue to import, and our exports will not grow unless our imports are permitted to expand.

This is the essence of the mutual economic interest in expanded international trade. In the 22 years since the trade agreements program was initiated, these truths have been put to work to bring great and enduring economic benefits to every sector of our economy. For wherever the genius of American production flourishes—and it has flourished in agriculture no less than in industry, in the South as well as in the North, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific—there you will find Americans employed in the production of goods for export. Correspondingly, we have availed ourselves, in return, of the products produced by the genius of foreign artisans and we have become richer because of it.

No better example of this relationship exists than in the historic trade relations between ourselves and Switzerland. It was in recognition of this trade with our sister democracy of Switzerland, that one of our first trade agreements made after the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act went into effect was concluded with Switzerland in 1936.

Spurred by that momentous agreement, our trade with Switzerland has expanded greatly. In 1936, our exports to Switzerland were valued at $7.5 million. That export trade has grown twentyfold in the years since 1936. Our exports to Switzerland are now valued at over $150 million.

It is a matter of record that Switzerland has been our best cash customer in Europe. We send her a wide variety of products, ranging from foodstuffs like meat products, grains, fruits, fats and oils, and cotton to manufactured goods such as iron and steel-mill products, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, and chemicals.

In return, Switzerland's most important exports to the United States are her fine jeweled watch movements which have a deserved reputation of excellence throughout the world. Indeed, Switzerland's watch exports to the United States account for 40 percent of her total export sales to us. One can readily see how vital these sales are to Switzerland's earning power and her ability to buy from the United States. Any decline in these sales, such as we experienced recently and which I will describe shortly, can only have a direct and adverse effect on our export sales to Switzerland. Such an unfortunate set of circumstances is certain to impair American production, employment, and incomes.

Like many regions in the United States, my native city of Detroit produces significantly for the export market. The Detroit Board of Commerce has estimated that 1 out of every 7 persons employed in manufacturing in the Detroit area owes his livelihood to export trade. In addition, many jobs depend on the import-export business which moves through the great port of Detroit which has grown to be the second most important in the Nation in terms of the dollar value of the trade handled. One can readily see how important foreign trade is in keeping people working and maintaining payrolls at high levels. The automobile industry alone, through its export markets, helps employment and payrolls in a myriad of other industries, such as rubber, steel, glass, and chemicals that are located throughout the United States.

Indeed, the maintenance and growth of our exports is vital to the well-being not only of Detroit's industries, but of other industries spread over the vast extent of our country.

Now, Switzerland alone offers a most important export market for the products of Detroit industry. Let me cite, for example, the value of our exports to Switzerland for 3 categories of products alone: automobiles, office machines, and pharmaceuticals. From Department of Commerce data, I learned that in 1955, the United States exported to Switzerland $10 million worth of automobiles, $3.5 million worth of office machines and $4 million worth of medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations. Thus, in export sales to Switzerland alone, these 3 industries that are so prominent in the economy of the Detroit region, have a market of $17.5 million, in 1955. Behind these dollar export figures are jobs, payrolls, taxes, and profits vital to the welfare of the American economy.

That is the nature of the benefits of reciprocity. To give one further illustration, I read a news report the other day which cited the fact that in January, Swissair, the Swiss airlines, announced the purchase of 2 Douglas DC–8 intercontinental jet airliners at a cost of $16.3 million. This purchase is a continuation of Swissair's long-established policy of buying American-made equipment which was begun in 1932. Reflect for a moment what the impact on our American aircraft industry and all its suppliers would be if the Swiss were to reverse this traditional policy and decided, say for reasons of national security, that all its airplanes had to be manufactured at home.

I fear that we do not often enough stop to consider the real meaning of these facts. We are all concerned about growing unemployment. There have been reports recently that unemployment in the automobile industry is approaching the 50,000 mark, and Harlow Curtice, the president of General Motors, has predicted a 14 percent decline in automobile production for 1956. But we all have the unfortunate tendency of not paying adequate attention to the strategic importance which our export trade has to high levels of employment and production at home. In particular, there is a tendency to think of exports as something separate from imports—as if there were no relation between the two—as if we could limit imports of certain products without that having an effect on exports.

But, of course, that is not true and it is very unrealistic to think that way. Our exports have a direct and vital dependence on our imports. In the case of Swiss-American trade, if we see that watch imports are imperiled, then we must at the very same time see that our exports of automobiles, phamaceuticals, office machines, aircraft—and indeed, cotton, tobacco, and textiles—that all these are likewise imperiled. And the American economy sells over $150 million worth of goods to Switzerland which fall into this category.

It is for these reasons that I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that United States imports of watches from Switzerland have suffered a serious decline over the past two years, due in no small part to actions, either taken or threatened, by this administration. In 1953, we imported $71 million worth of watches and watch movements from Switzerland; in 1954, $54 million; and in 1955, these imports were running at $42 million. It is clear that this serious falloff in our imports of Swiss watches has already affected some of our exports to Switzerland and, unless some improvement takes place, our entire export trade with Switzerland will be placed in jeopardy. Yet what has happened? Has this administration taken the positive steps necessary to restore to watch imports their rightful share in the American market. The answer is "No." We all are too familiar with the action taken in July 1954, by the President to increase the tariffs on watch imports by 50 percent under the escape clause.

But as if this were not enough, there have ensued a whole series of actions and threats of actions designed further to restrict the importation of Swiss watches. At this very moment, there are grave threats overhanging our trade relations with Switzerland that cast, like a forbidding cloud, gray doubt and uncertainty before it. This is, I submit, a most unseemly way to treat a good friend and customer.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that rather than move backward, the administration should reverse its direction and begin to do something constructive to stem the precipitous decline in our watch imports. The first thing that should be done is to review and reverse the escape-clause decision of July 1954 as provided for by law. In offering this suggestion,

I am doing no more than repeating the recommendation made by the distinguished Governor of Maryland, T. R. McKeldin, a Republican himself, who is much concerned with our foreign-trade relations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal which should commend itself to all Democrats and Republicans alike. Indeed, a trade policy that seeks the freeing and expansion of world trade, that seeks the enhanced use of our own economic resources, that seeks a firmer binding of the ties of mutual interest between the nations of the free world—such a foreign-trade policy must be bipartisan in scope. Through the instrumentality of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation and by following our now traditional guidelines, our foreign-trade policy must become an increasingly important part of our total foreign policy. Through it we can achieve a stronger community of free nations and greater economic prosperity at home.

I close, Mr. Speaker, with a plea for following with determination the enlightened course charted in the early 1930's by Cordell Hull. No less can be expected of us and, truly, we could choose no better path today.

HONORING SURVIVING VETERANS OF THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, today I offer a resolution to provide for a joint session of the Congress to honor the surviving veterans of the War Between the States, and to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each of them.

Almost 91 years have passed since that war ended on April 9, 1865, and it is altogether remarkable that there are still a few living survivors both in the South and in the North. In their earliest youth these men knew from first-hand experience the price that had to be paid for division. But they saw the end of the conflict, and the days of reconstruction. They witnessed the healing of the wounds of war and the resurgence of a nation united in common accord. Two world wars have come and gone, and yet we remember these men who are a link with our past and a reminder of that psalm:

> Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. (Psalm cxxxiii: 1.)

It has been the practice of the Congress to commemorate special occasions by awarding medals as a symbol of a belief in an ideal. A medal is something more than a gold medallion. It is the recognition of an event, an award to a deserving person who personifies that event, and a concept of a nation's values.

To honor this handful of survivors of all those men who played a part in the Confederate and Federal armies would be to pay tribute not only to them but also to the tradition of unity that exists among our 48 States.

What I propose is a joint session of the Congress of the United States in which the veterans of the War Between the States will be the center of a ceremony symbolizing the oneness and the indivisibility of this country. I propose that the remaining survivors be cordially and wholeheartedly invited to come here for this ceremony at Government expense—both the Confederate and the Federal survivors—and that they be honored with all due courtesy. I ask, further, that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to strike off a medallion suitable for the event, and that this medal serve as a decoration on the occasion for each of the survivors.

Recognizing that age brings infirmity and that ill health may prevent actual attendance at the ceremony for one or more of the surviving veterans, my resolution also provides that the presentation may be made at the home of any surviving veteran or veterans who cannot come to the Capitol at Washington for the presentation ceremonies and the joint session.

The bestowal of this honor at such a ceremony is both timely and appropriate. It is timely because life is running out for the men on both sides who offered their last full measure of devotion to the cause in which they believed. It is timely, also, because our country is currently living in the phenomenon of a remarkable public interest in the personalities and the circumstances of the War Between the States. This may be because of that extraordinary novel, Gone With the Wind, and the wealth of American literature—fiction, biography, and history—that followed in its wake. It may, again be the result of the depth of feeling Americans recognize about a war that had such leaders in the South as Robert E. Lee and in the North as Abraham Lincoln.

It is to be expected that among sovereign and dynamic States, and among groups of Americans living in varying climates of opinion, there will be diversity amidst unity. This is similar to that concept in literature which we call unity in variety, "the principle that beauty in art, depends on the fusion of a variety of elements into an organic whole which produces a single impression." It is to be expected that in the vast continental expanse of our Nation there will be differences of opinion and that they may, from time to time, excite strong feels as various issues are debated. But we have a way of settling such matters by majority vote, and by passing laws which have—as Mr. Justice Holmes so aptly phrased it—the support of a "preponderant public opinion."

Over and above these measures, should we not emphasize the constructive forces of our society—emphasize the essential unity and oneness of the North and the South—one Nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all?

The ceremony I propose, the awards, the very presence together, side by side, of the soldiers who still survive from the armies of the North and the armies of the South, will, under the roof of this Capitol, provide the living proof of the prophetic aims for which, in the end, both Robert E. Lee and Abraham Lincoln strove so mightily. For as we all know, General Lee and President Lincoln saw eye to eye on the future of this Nation once the guns of war had been stilled.

For decades the line of survivors has been thinning and is now threatening to disappear altogether. The opportunity is, as of this moment, held out to us, to translate a kind of final encampment of the Confederate and Federal armies into a gesture that will give us all a reborn faith in the valor and the toughness that make this country great.

For me it seems an event upon which we can all unite. It is an event we must provide for now for it cannot wait. It will give the Nation the dramatic and arresting spectacle of a force that once divided the country now uniting it. The very character of the scene will carry with it all the meaning and emphasis of history, the history that in the light of developments, binds a nation together. It will be the living testimony of a prophecy come true. The Nation will have afforded it the ultimate proof that there was, indeed, malice toward none and charity for all.

And I know of no place, more hallowed, more precisely fitting, more awe-inspiring for a ceremony symbolizing ultimate and consummated reconciliation than the Halls of the Congress of the United States.

STANDBY WHILE THEY CLOSE THE SKIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this hour's time in order that some of my colleagues and myself may speak on a subject which is very important to the Nation and important to the people of California.

Mr. Speaker, growing numbers of Americans who use air transportation are all familiar with the word "standby."

Those of us who have tried to reserve seats in a hurry out of Washington know these words very well.

The last remaining independent airline of any size—the California airline group of war veterans that introduced the first coast-to-coast aircoach flights 10 years ago is still standing by. North American Airlines of Burbank, is standing by wondering whether it is going to be allowed to enter the United States trunkline air carrier family.

The plight of North American is important to us in California. This pioneering aircoach service brings over 125,000 people to and from California every year. Its innovation of transcontinental aircoach fares sets the pace for similar economy aircoach flights to our State.

North American's management, developed the first aircoach service idea in 1945 and flew the first low-cost California-New York aircoach flights in 1946. Other airlines, who said at first, "it could not be done," did not generally offer

their passengers aircoach economy until 1952.

North American gave the public the first $99 transcontinental coach fares and saw this economy copied by other airlines in 1952. Still operating without subsidy, as they did from the very first, North American in 1952 reduced its coast-to-coast round-trip fare to $160, a rate that was not matched by the big airlines until September 1955.

But now—having led the way in giving the public the first real economies in air travel and having led the industry reluctantly to adopt the very economy flights that have given the big carriers their greatest mass passenger market, North American is told to stand by.

While celebrating the 10th anniversary of their idea that has revolutionized air travel, North American has been snarled in administrative redtape. It has been singled out on economic grounds alone, for special technical "treatment" by the Civil Aeronautics Board. And if the "treatment" works, North American would be grounded and forever forbidden by Government edict to offer any more new ideas, new economies, new "firsts" to the public and to air transportation in the years ahead.

The potency and impact of the North American economy idea has already been firmly established in its very first 10 years.

But how about the 10 years ahead? Well it is clear that if the first 10 years of struggle to implant new economy ideas in air transportation have been this difficult for North American, the next 10 years without the kind of competitive spur this kind of airline operation provides, are going to be equally difficult unless the CAB starts administering the act as Congress intended.

Because the skies—by CAB edict—have been all but closed to new airline competition on major passenger trunk routes. More recently they've been closed for all practical purposes on the high-cost, to-luxury overseas routes.

Let us look at the recent CAB record of saying "no" to new competitive ideas offered by North American to save the public money and to increase air travel for the whole industry.

My New York colleagues, who fly to and from Washington, now pay $30.14 for a first-class round trip, which, of course, usually involves trying your luck with weekend standbys. A New York-Washington coach fare of a straight $20 would now be in effect if the CAB had approved North American's application of 2 years ago to provide a continuous low-cost shuttle service between New York and Washington.

My colleagues—and their constituents—from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Miami, Dallas, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Denver, and other cities in a 21-city network would now be paying about 33 percent less for air-coach travel in and out of these cities if the CAB had approved North American's application to introduce true low-fare air coach of 3.2 cents a mile. But the CAB said "No" and a possible saving of $100 million a year to passengers in and out of these cities was buried.

All Americans and Europeans who have long hoped for the day when they could fly the Atlantic at fares within their means had a rude jolt last month when the CAB turned down North American's application to provide low-cost air-coach service between the United States and Europe at fares about half the lowest off-season tourist rates charged. The CAB had previously pointed with some pride to the fact that domestic coach fares of 3.2 cents per mile are now in effect between New York and California. But, under pressure again from those who said lower fares were "impossible" across the Atlantic, the Board turned down North American's application for true low-fare overseas-coach service. As a final blow to air travelers—after rejecting the North American idea—the CAB under pressure has approved a first-class-fare increase across the Atlantic. As a sop to public opinion, however, the Board still apologetically states that air-tourist fares across the ocean are too high.

The fact is that the public now pays more than double to fly over salt water. It pays twice as much to fly across the ocean in the same planes as it does to fly air coach to and from California. Why does it cost twice as much to fly over salt water? The reason is elementary. Completely controlled by an international cartel there is no independent competition over the ocean to provide the price yardstick which North American has done over land.

So these big ideas for future economy in air travel have been summarily brushed off by the CAB. All the ideas came from North American just as did the idea of low-cost domestic air coach, the idea we just celebrated.

Tuesday was a milestone in air transportation progress, the 10th birthday of the first coast-to-coast air coach economy flights. It would be tragic for the public and the industry if this milestone became a tombstone.

The sound alternative, it seems to me, is for Congress to take a new look at the fortifications which have been built by Government regulation to protect and preserve the skies from encroachment from any new major trunk line air competition. Congress wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938 and incorporated in the act the legislative intent that there should be competition in air transportation. There has been no new competition allowed by the CAB on major passenger routes for 18 long years. There has never been a comprehensive Congressional investigation of trunk line air passenger rates. This seems more than passing strange, because wherever there has been vigorous new independent air coach competition—such as between New York and California—air coach rates have been forced down. Wherever the CAB has not permitted new competition to enter route service, air coach fares of the big carriers stay at higher levels.

So it seems to be up to Congress to take a good careful look at this development of a sky monopoly, to see why no new carriers have been certified for major route competition, to see why fares have not been brought down as they could and should be on both domestic and overseas routes.

It is our Civil Aeronautics Act. And the Board should be called to account when its enforcement of the act runs contrary to the intent of Congress.

In the public interest we cannot stand by forever while they close the sky.

	All year-round 1st class	Present coach rate	Proposed North American Airline fare
Shannon	$371	$261	$125.00
London	400	290	140.00
Paris	420	310	146.50
Frankfort	438	328	156.00
Rome	487	360	175.00

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

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

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, we from California take special pride today in the fact that aircoach was launched by California veterans 10 years ago this month.

Our State has not only contributed much, but has gained much from low-cost aircoach—an idea which was first ventured by North American Airline's present management. North American flies some 60,000 passengers into California each year, and, of course, additional tens of thousands of coach passengers are brought by other air carriers which followed the footsteps of the pioneer independent company.

Ten years ago the first coach flight, a DC–3, took off with 22 passengers. This year almost half of the total air-passenger traffic will travel aircoach.

What will we be celebrating some 10 years hence? Will it be the 20th anniversary of aircoach and an age of popular air transportation, comparable with the automotive age?

Or will it be an entirely opposite situation? Today North American's continued existence hangs on the thread of a court stay, preventing temporarily the execution of the CAB's order grounding the carrier. Ten years hence it is entirely possible that there will be no independent competitor, and that, to judge by the past decade, even the present number of 12 certificated carriers will be reduced, so that there may be only 8 or even fewer domestic carriers.

Why should we be wary of such a development and do all in our power to prevent this happening? I make no special case for any one company, nor do I hold any company to blame. It is in the nature of our economic system, that where there is independent competition, the public, the consumer, profits. Where everything is closed to competition, and the industry is regulated by the Government or regulates itself, you have a monopoly situation, and scarcity breeds high prices and generally poor service.

Any reasonable person familiar with the facts knows that the elimination of North American will spell an increase

in prices for all air travelers. Here are the facts:

North American adopted $160 transcontinental round-trip fares in 1953. Three major airlines, American, TWA, and United, adopted their rate in September 1955, to run for a 6-month period, expiring on March 15 of this year.

It was expected that North American would be out of business by March 15. But, with the CAB's decision being stayed pending appeal in the courts, the major carriers have now announced that they will extend the low rates, TWA and United for 6 months, and American Airlines for 60 days.

I quote from Aviation Daily of February 15, 1956:

AA ASKS 60-DAY EXTENSION OF EXCURSION FARE

American Airlines, in contrast to 6-month proposals of competing lines, has asked CAB for a 60-day extension of the $160 round-trip transcontinental coach excursion fare. Tariffs of American, TWA, and United, filed last September, are currently scheduled to expire March 15. TWA and United have proposed extensions until September 15.

American's revised tariff would expire May 18. Spokesman for the airline said the limited extension is proposed so that a more complete picture may be obtained on which to decide whether the special low fares should apply during the peak summer travel season. The fare is available only when round trip tickets are purchased and travel, limited to Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, each week, is completed within 30 days. Normal one-way transcontinental coach fare is $99.

Interestingly enough, in the same issue of Aviation Daily appears this item, regarding the fate of North American before the courts:

COURT CONSIDERS NORTH AMERICAN'S APPEAL FROM CAB DECISION

United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, has taken under advisement the appeal of North American Airlines seeking reversal of CAB's decision revoking its nonscheduled airline operating authority. Final arguments were heard Monday by Judges Edgerton, Washington, and Danaher. The CAB decision has been stayed pending outcome of the appeal. There are no indications as to when the Court might be expected to act, although it previously served notice on the parties that it desired an expedited proceeding."

It is obvious that the major airlines plan to maintain this $160 fare only so long as North American continues in business.

And it is also obvious that as soon as transcontinental fares go up, all fares will be upgraded.

For these reasons, I feel it is imperative that the appropriate Congressional committees go to the heart of this matter immediately. Whatever the solution, it must come now, while North American is still in the air. There is nothing deader than a small business that is not operating unless it is an airline that is not flying.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLN], and the gentlemen from California [Mr. UTT and Mr. HOSMER] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, when we are saluting the first decade of air-coach flights, a constructive advance in air transportation, my home city of Long Beach, Calif, has historic importance and significance.

Ten years ago a youthful California combat flier named Stanley Weiss, not long discharged from service as a pilot over the hazardous Hump, piloted from the Long Beach airport the first transcontinental air coach flight in this country. Like other ex-GI's, Weiss and his associate, James Fischgrund, a former Navy lieutenant commander in the Pacific, had been encouraged by our Government to get into aviation. They read official Government booklets telling them how to enter the air transportation business. These booklets were called, I believe, War Wings for Peace.

They also read Government literature instructing them how to obtain Federal loans, in order to buy Government transport aircraft for conversion into civilian service.

With their own savings and an RFC loan for $30,000, these two California veterans purchased a DC–3 aircraft. It was in this plane, converted and adapted for passenger service, that they flew that first air-coach flight from Long Beach to New York, in 18 hours, with 4 stops en route, carrying 22 passengers.

The two veterans did not make the newspapers with that flight. They were too busy handling all details of their ground and air operations to be very conscious of the fact that they were making air transportation history. But history they did make, as they were joined by two other California air-coach pioneers, J. B. Lewis and Ross R. Hart, in forming the present North American Airlines group.

So this pioneering of air coach was, in its first stages, a California development by California independent business men, who saw and met the need for a new kind of low-cost air transportation service. Later other independents—some 300 companies, in fact—joined in the mushrooming development of air coach. The North American group, which introduced the idea, has remained the largest survivor and has led the air-transportation industry to the present almost universal adoption of air-coach service.

The early Government loans have long since been paid back. For the North American idea, launched from Long Beach, has proved to be truly a billion-dollar idea in this past decade. Air coach is largely responsible for the recent record peak earnings of our airlines. Their profits, which air coach helped to swell, have helped our airlines stand on their own feet financially, without recourse to Government subsidy. And thus both airline passengers and taxpayers have been saved hundreds of millions of dollars by this amazing 10-year-old youngster—air coach.

This is an American story, story of free enterprise, functioning vigorously and competitively to bring new ideas, mass market economies and a greater volume of profits to a great American industry.

Here we see demonstrated the principle which has made the free enterprise system great. By reducing unit costs the volume of business increased enormously—so that fares were reduced and the industry grew. Today, thanks to the North American idea which was first tested in that historic flight from Long Beach in February 1946, aviation has become our fastest growing business.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what has been said here today about the importance of preserving and perhaps reaffirming the right of entry into an American industry in which new competition has demonstrated it can make new and valuable contributions in the public interest.

With your permission I should like to quote some excerpts from a news dispatch published Sunday, January 22, in the New York Herald Tribune. This article is headed "Travel By Air Coach Has Phenomenal Rise."

It goes on to state:

Scheduled air-coach travel is a relatively recent development, with the nonscheduled (independent) lines deserving a bow for literally forcing the low-cost travel issue.

The article then points out that there was almost no air coach on the major airlines in 1948, whereas today approximately 33 percent or more of the schedule airlines' business is air coach.

"Why this spectacular growth?" the article asks. It goes further and states that our big air lines "were, in the opinion of many, slow to adopt air coach—but when they finally did, expansion was fast."

Careful investigation of the history of this phenomenal development shows that these facts are substantially correct. Air coach, launched 10 years ago this month, was the proud postwar baby of former GI fliers. They were encouraged by Government to get into the business. They nursed the baby along for 2 years with their own money and without Government subsidy payments. They met a real public need by providing the first true low-cost air fares.

But while they were trying to nurture this new mass air passenger market, the large subsidized passenger carriers looked askance at the infant. They predicted air coach would never live because it—the whole idea of lower fares for more people—was impractical and impossible. So as a result of their early reluctance to give the American people air coach, the independents had to go it alone in order to prove their point that what the United States airline industry really needed was passengers—not subsidies.

The independents—such as North American—were right. Their pioneering has helped the United States airline industry place itself in a better position to cope with a general downturn than at any time in its history, according to a recent talk by Joseph H. Fitzgerald, director of the Civil Aeronautics Board's air operations bureau. Mr. Fitzgerald stated, "improved reliability and speed,

accompanied by lower fares in relation to all other prices" has made air travel a primary means of travel between cities separated by any appreciable distance."

It is quite clear, then, that new competition—the competition of the North American air coach idea—has been good for the public and good for the industry.

Yet North American, the largest surviving independent airline of some 300 hopefully started by war veterans a decade ago, is still trying desperately on its 10th birthday to secure from the Civil Aeronautics Board a certificate to furnish broader, low-cost air coach service extending beyond its present New York-California, New York-Florida, and New York-Texas routes.

The CAB has to date turned this competitive-minded airline group down by seeking to revoke its operating authority for flying "too regularly." No question of safety is involved and no question is raised concerning the fitness of North American to operate an airline reliably and efficiently.

The CAB has denied all of this airline's applications to offer new low-fare air coach competition on major routes. It also turned down this airline's plea to fly from the United States to Europe at fares 50 percent lower than the lowest tourist fares now charged overseas.

This presents the rather appalling picture of a Government bureau valiantly determined to hold the line to protect the skies and the 12 major trunk airlines from a newcomer who only seeks to offer the kind of low-fare competition that builds mass traffic, increases profits for everyone, and saves the air traveler both travel and tax money.

The CAB has not granted its required certificate of convenience and necessity to a single new trunk passenger airline since 1938, nearly 18 years ago. Since then the original 18 big trunk carriers had shrunk to 12 through mergers and consolidations.

We are all entitled to ask today the same questions that this airline has been asking the CAB:

Are the skies permanently closed to all new competition, new ideas, new economy services on our major passenger routes? * * * Is it in the public interest for a single Federal regulatory bureau to use its powers, contrary to the intent of Congress, to bar entry of qualified new trunk carriers in air passenger transportation?

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 2, in religious services the world over, Roman Catholics will present their spiritual leader, his holiness Pope Pius XII, a great spiritual bouquet for a happy 80th birthday. I think it fitting and proper that we, in this great Congress, wish his holiness a most happy birthday.

Without a guided missile he has pierced the most formidable forces against truth and justice. Without a single atom bomb he has established an impregnable defense to the dignity of the individual under God from the forces from an enemy who possesses every destructive method to human dignity conceived by man's mind.

I think it proper to recall briefly the history of this great man. He was born on March 2, 1876, Eugenio Maria Joseph Pacelli, in an apartment house in Rome, Italy, the son of a pious and God-fearing family. In 1899 he was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in Rome, Italy. In 1901, after several years of the type of parish work that is the duty of most ministers of God, he became a member of the diplomatic corps of the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1917 he became Titular Archbishop of Sardes. In 1929 he became a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, and in 1930 the secretary of state of the Roman Catholic faith.

On his birthday, March 2, 1939, he was selected the spiritual leader of Roman Catholics the world over. He is the first Catholic pope to have ever visited this country. He has an especial love for the people of the United States and its country. In his visit to the United States he made the following statement concerning his impression of our great men:

I have seen some of the most striking natural beauties of the United States: the Grand Canyon, the Rocky Mountains, Niagara Falls, and several other world-renowned places.

I have seen also many of the sources of the inexhaustible natural wealth of this country, vast stretches of farming and grazing lands, lakes, rivers, oil lands, mine regions, and vast forests.

Visiting industrial centers with their extensive manufacturing plants, gazing on high buildings and from them seeing great bridges and vast projects for supplying power, light, and irrigation, like Boulder Dam, over which I flew, have made a deep impression on me as eloquently indicative of the genius of the American people.

During his life to date, Pope Pius the XII has been a priest, bishop, cardinal, apostle, a cosmopolitan, a teacher, shepherd, heralder of peace, protector of law, defender of the city of Rome, benefactor of mankind, an educator, and a social reformer.

It is reputed among persons of the Catholic faith that St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, in 1143 made prophecies concerning the various popes of the Roman Catholic faith. Although these prophecies have not always been consistent with the facts, in 1143 Pope Pius was identified as Pastor Angelicus, the Angelic Shepherd. I think none could find a better description of the life and work of this great spiritual leader than the reputed prophecy.

Most of his popely life has been devoted to working toward the world peace that this century has sought with such suffering.

I think it appropriate to recall to the Members of this House some of the statements this great spiritual leader has made concerning internal and international affairs in the hope that they might give some guidance to us in our deliberations in years to come.

On the question of domestic affairs, Pope Pius XII stated on September 1, 1944, that "a well-regulated economic and social order must rest on the solid basis of the right to private property." He said, in Quadragesimo Anno:

Private property is in a particular way the natural fruit of labor, the product of the concentrated activity of man which he acquires by his determination to develop and insure his own existence and that of his family; to create for himself and for his loved ones a free and respectable life, not only economic, but political, cultural, and religious. The Christian conscience, therefore, cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders practically impossible or useless the natural right of property not only to commodities but also to the means of production.

Likewise, it cannot accept another system which recognizes, it is true, the natural right of property but conceives of it in an erroneous way and which therefore is opposed to a just and healthy natural law that kind of capitalism which is based upon erroneous conceptions and unduly assigns unto itself an unlimited right to property without any subordination to the common good.

With respect to employer-employee relations, he stated to Italian workmen on March 11, 1945:

We should aspire to a higher unity which will bridge the differences between management and labor; which will unite all who participate in the production, and this solidarity is based on the duty of all parties to work together for the interests and needs of society as a whole. This solidarity must embrace all the branches of production; must form the foundation of a better economic order, of a sound and just economy; it must open the roads for the working class to obtain its legitimate responsible part in the management of the national economy.

With respect to the farmer and his problems, he stated in August 1947:

One of the main causes of the disturbance and confusion in the world economy is to be found in the lamentable disregard and even contempt which people show with regard to the agriculturists and their important work. Does history not teach us that such an attitude is the forerunner of the decline of civilization? And is it not significant that precisely in the big cities the alarm is sounded to return to the land and raise a healthy, vigorous Christian peasantry, a farmer's stock which may form a strong dam against which will break the ever-higher rising tidal wave of physical and moral decay?

With respect to immigration, Pope Pius XII stated:

Causes of world tensions are, among other things, limited national territory and lack of primary materials. Some countries are really overcrowded and instead of forcing these countries to import food at great costs, why are emigration and immigration not made easier, why are families which so desire not allowed to go to countries where it will be much easier for them to make a living?

In a letter to former President Truman, on August 26, 1947, he stated with respect to civil rights:

Social injustices, racial injustices, and religious animosities exist today among men and groups who boast of Christian civilization. And they are a very useful and often effective weapon in the hands of those who are bent on destroying all the good which that civilization has brought to men. It is for all sincere lovers of the great human

family to unite in wresting those weapons from hostile hands.

He has made many statements concerning international relationships between nations designed towards the attempt to secure peace among nations.

In the United Nations Assembly, he said, in September 1948:

Shortly, as you know, the Assembly of the United Nations will resume its sessions, duly authorized to grapple with problems of world peace and security. Men of learning and experience, of high character and lofty ideals, fully conscious of their momentous responsibility to civilization and culture, will put forth their best efforts to reinsure the family of nations, and, as we fondly hope, not only save it from an unimaginable cataclysm, but put it on the road that leads to joy in justice to all, workingmen and employer alike, to morality in national and individual life that has found its only possible basis in religious faith in God. If ever an assembly of men, gathered at a critical crossroad in history, needed the help of prayer, it is this assembly of the United Nations.

He said, in a Christmas message on December 24, 1948:

A convinced Christian cannot confine himself within an easy and egotistical isolationism, when he witnesses the needs and the misery of his brothers; when pleas for help come to him from those in economic distress; when he knows the aspirations of the working classes for more normal and just conditions of life; when he is aware of the abuses of an economic system which puts money above social obligations; when he is not ignorant of the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the separate nations together, and imposing on each one of them many and varied duties toward the great family of nations.

The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations.

In a Christmas message given in 1954, on the question of our international responsibility, he urged the world to change its principle of coexistence predicated upon economic or military might or fear of the destructiveness of modern weapons, to a coexistence predicated upon divine truths.

He acknowledged coexistence predicated upon fear would produce real peace only if it developed into a fear of God.

He stated, particularly, to we Representatives in our dealings with domestic and international policy:

In both camps, there are millions in whom the imprint of Christ is preserved in a more or less active degree; they too, no less than faithful and fervent believers, should be called upon to collaborate toward a renewed basis of unity for the human race. It is true that, in one of the two camps, the voice of those who stand resolutely for truth, for love, and for the spirit, is forcibly suffocated by the public authorities, while in the other people suffer from excessive timidity in proclaiming aloud their worthy desires. It is, however, the duty of a policy of unification to encourage the former and to make heard the sentiments of the latter.

Particularly in that camp where it is not a crime to oppose error, statesmen should have greater confidence in themselves: They should give proof to others of a more firm courage in foiling the maneuvers of the obscure forces which are still trying to establish power hegemonies, and they should also show more active wisdom in preserving and swelling the ranks of men of good will, especially of believers in God, who everywhere adhere in great numbers to the cause of peace.

It would certainly be an erroneous unification policy—if not actually treachery—to sacrifice in favor of nationalistic interests the racial minorities who are without strength to defend their supreme possessions; their faith and their Christian culture. Whoever were to do this would not be worthy of confidence, nor would they be acting honorably if later, in cases where their own interests demanded it, they were to invoke religious values and respect for law.

There are many who volunteer to lay the bases of human unity. Since, however, these bases, this bridge, must be of a spiritual nature, those sceptics and cynics are certainly not qualified for the task who, in accordance with doctrines of a more or less disguised materialism, reduce even the loftiest truths and the highest spiritual values to the level of physical reactions or consider them mere ideologies.

Nor are those apt for the task who do not recognize absolute truths nor admit moral obligations in the sphere of social life. These latter have already in the past—often unknowingly, by their abuse of freedom and by their destructive and unreasonable criticism—prepared an atmosphere favorable to dictatorship and oppression; and now they push forward again to obstruct the work of social and political pacification initiated under Christian inspiration.

In some places it happens not rarely that they raise their voices against those who, conscientiously, as Christians, take a rightful active interest in political problems and in public life in general.

Now and then likewise, they disparage the assuredness and strength Christians draw from the possession of absolute truth, and, on the contrary, they spread abroad the conviction that it is to modern man's honor, and redounds to the credit of his education, that he should have no determined ideas or tendencies, nor be bound to any spiritual world. Meanwhile, they forget that it was precisely from these principles that the present confusion and disorder originated, nor will they remember that it was those very Christian forces they now oppose that succeeded in restoring, in many countries, the freedom which they themselves had dissipated.

Certainly it is not upon such men that the common spiritual foundation can be laid and the bridge of truth built. Indeed, it may well be expected that, as occasion demands, they will not find it at all unseemly to be partial to the false system of the other shore, adapting themselves even to be overcome by it in case it were momentarily to triumph.

In awaiting, therefore, with confidence in the divine mercy, that spiritual and Christian bridge, already in some way existing between the two shores, to take on a greater and more effective consistency, we would exhort primarily the Christians of the nations where the divine gift of peace is still enjoyed to do everything possible to hasten the hour of its universal reestablishment.

In his most recent message given last Christmas, he spoke upon the subject of arms and armaments control, and made this warning:

Efforts toward peace must consist not only in measures aimed at restricting the possibility of waging war, but even more in preventing, eliminating or lessening with time the quarrels between nations which might lead to war.

Many Members of Congress in effecting their congressional responsibility have visited Pope Pius and have been awed by his saintliness.

On this, his 80th birthday, I would like to add my prayers to those of Catholics everywhere, that the years ahead will be joyous for His Holiness Pope Pius the XII, and that he may in his lifetime observe the culmination of the hope he prayed for when he was coronated Pope Pius the XII:

Turning our eyes toward Him who is the Father of Light and the God of all consolation, and placing ourselves under the protection of the mother of good counsel, who was the patron of the conclave, we assume the government of the bark of Peter, in the hope of steering it as safely as possible through floods and storms to the harbor of peace.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, March 2, 1956, marks the 80th birthday of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. I am sure that all men of good will everywhere, representing all the religious faiths of mankind, hope and pray that this great leader will enjoy many more full, healthy years in the service of mankind. He became a priest in the Basilica of Saint Mary Major on April 2, 1899. In 1904 he became a monsignor, and soon an envoy on many missions abroad. On February 7, 1930, he became Papal Secretary of State, under Pope Pius XI. On March 2, 1939, Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli was elected to Peter's Chair.

Even those who do not acknowledge the Pope's religious leadership recognize in him a world leader of great significance. In every quarter of the globe he is particularly respected for his efforts in behalf of peace. In August, 1939, only a few months after his election as Pope Pius XII, he said to the leaders of nations and to their peoples,

"The danger is imminent, but there is yet time. Nothing is lost with peace; all may be lost with war. Let them begin negotiations anew, conferring with good will and respect for reciprocal rights. Then will they find that to sincere and conscientious negotiations an honorable solution is never precluded."

Pope Pius XII, styled the "Pope of Peace," persisted in his efforts to maintain peace but the demon of war was not to be stopped and war broke out on September 1, 1939. Even then he appealed to the belligerents to observe the ethical rules of combat and begged relief for the wounded and war prisoners. Mussolini defied papal pleas to keep Italy neutral and in June 1940 rushed to share in the spoils of fallen France. One year later Hitler turned on his erstwhile Communist ally. On December 7 of the same year the United States was catapulted into the war by the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. The whole world was aflame. The holy father frequently

urged all men of good will to pray that humanity might see the folly of war and the necessity of forsaking injustice, immorality and selfishness.

Knowing communism as the enemy of peace Pope Pius XII was and is communism's first and foremost opponent. He knew that communism was the avowed enemy of Christianity and he recognized that communism was an ideology and that ideologies will never be defeated by wars, but only by sounder ideas and programs more vigorously advocated and put into practice.

On one occasion the arch atheist and materialist, Stalin, snidely asked, "How many divisions does the Pope have?" When asked what he thought about Stalin's inquiry, his holiness said: "You may tell my son Joseph he will meet my divisions in the hereafter."

Despite the fact that cardinals, bishops, priests, and the heroic laity were imprisoned, exiled, and martyred, the pope never once called for a preventive war. Instead, he incessantly appealed for a revival of virtue and love of all men. The 1955 Christmas appeal for armament control in the nuclear age was a natural follow-through of the holy father's constant concern for peace with justice.

On this anniversary of the pope's birthday the world should recall what he said at the address on the feast of St. Eugene, June 2, 1947:

> The future belongs to those who love, not to those who hate.

To his holiness the hearts of humanity everywhere extend its good wishes and congratulations. The people of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois send to the pope our wishes and prayers for many years of continued service to God and further contributions toward world peace.

Mr. MURRAY or Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in wishing a happy birthday to his holiness, Pius XII. The world knows of his abilities as a diplomat, a teacher, a defender of freedom and a holy servant of God. If I may be permitted a small vanity, I would like to point out that March 2 is my own birthday and as a result I have always felt a particular happiness that I share the day with one who is truly a saint, and who, in my opinion, is the greatest living man in the world today. You can imagine with what joy and humility I met him this past fall when members of the committee with which I was traveling had the high honor of an audience with the holy father. It is gratifying to report from personal observation that the holy father appeared vigorous and alert. May I express the prayerful wish on behalf of the Catholics in my district and of all men and women of good will therein that the holy father continues in good health. He is needed by the world in the fight against atheism.

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. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. TUMULTY, for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, on Tuesday next, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. PATMAN and to include certain excerpts and statements at the end of today's proceedings.

Mr. ASPINALL, his remarks in general debate today on H. R. 3383 and to include additional material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to include certain maps and extracts.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include newspaper articles and excerpts from committee hearings.

Mr. PATTERSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCMILLAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. SHEEHAN).

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. MACDONALD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. CHELF), for approximately 5 days, on account of business in home district in Kentucky.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DEANE), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of contracts, in excess of $50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1587. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a signed report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1955, made by Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City, independent certified public accountants, pursuant to section 14 (b) of Public Law 685, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1588. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the share of defense procurement which small business has been receiving, together with recommendations for further action to increase its share, pursuant to section 5 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1589. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $3 million for the Department of the Interior and $250,000 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. FEIGHAN: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7588. A bill for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas (Rept. No. 1842). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9285. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; without amendment (Rept. No. 1843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the United States Civil Service Commission (Rept. No. 1844). 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. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9677. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary

of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9678. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9679. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam Site Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9680. A bill to provide for accrued servicemen's indemnity payments in certain cases; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 9681. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Missouri for use of the Missouri Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 9682. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 9683. A bill to repeal section 4231 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9684. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the use of safe deposit boxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9685. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 9686. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9687. A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 9688. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 9689. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 9690. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act so as to provide for elections by secret ballot of employees to determine whether to strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 9691. A bill to increase the rate of pension of certain widows of World War I veterans and the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9692. A bill to amend part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9693. A bill to establish an additional pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 9694. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 9695. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that special equipment for disabled individuals shall not be subject to the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 9696. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9697. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 9698. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9699. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard Target Range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9700. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management, and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9701. A bill to protect members of the public against uninsured liabilities arising from hazards in peaceful utilization of atomic energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 9702. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 9703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to producers of cotton who have complied with acreage allotment programs for 1954, 1955, and 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9704. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to eliminate reduction in annuity made for surviving spouse, if spouse does not survive; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 568. Joint resolution exercising the power granted to Congress by section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution through a declaration that both public schools which are desegregated as to race, and public schools for the different races which are separate but equal, satisfy the requirements of such amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a joint session of the Congress to honor the surviving veterans of the War Between the States, and to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to such veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 570. Joint resolution to declare that the applicable requirements of the 14th amendment are satisfied in any State either by public schools which are desegregated as to race or by public schools for the different races which are separate but equal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 571. Joint resolution exercising the power granted to Congress by section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution through a declaration that both public schools which are desegregated as to race, and public schools for the different races which are separate but equal, satisfy the requirements of such amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 572. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1956, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 415. Resolution to appoint a special investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Res. 416. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study railroad accidents in the United States, giving particular attention to the accidents which have recently occurred; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the purpose of permitting juveniles to engage in productive pursuits and thereby aid in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, and recommending that eligible age for retirement be reduced to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security act so that total monthly benefit amounts will not be decreased upon the death of either spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 9705. A bill for the relief of Lea Kummer O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9706. A bill for the relief of Elpidofor Sedljar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Querard, nee Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9708. A bill for the relief of Chan Kim Tun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9709. A bill for the relief of Michael Monak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:
H. R. 9710. A bill for the relief of Alvin Uriah Wellington and wife, Daphne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:
H. R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Marianne Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. R. 9712. A bill for the relief of Diana Lightbourne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:
H. R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Grace Yu Ching Wang Li (nee Wang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Isidor Goldfracht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Julian Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:
H. R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Wiche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Charlotte A. Ruffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:
H. R. 9718. A bill for the relief of Moses Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 9719. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to insure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

602. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of Miss Anna M. Sweet and other residents of Herkimer, Mohawk, and Ilion, N. Y., in support of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to adopt the Hoover Commission report on the use and disposal of Federal surplus property and enact legislation necessary to permit the executive agencies to use the normal channels of distribution in the disposal of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salute to President Gronchi and Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in closing his address before the joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress, His Excellency the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi, used these words:

This is the Italy which today is before you, as a member in good standing of the great family of the Western Democracies.

These are significant words. President Gronchi employed them wisely and pointedly for he had placed before the American people and the Congress the case of the Republic of Italy. Who of us looking back over the postwar years can deny the great struggle for survival of a people imbued with the spirit of democracy? Who of us can deny that against great odds—these people have reached a point of amazing recovery. And who can deny their great and endless gratitude to the people of America for their assistance, and the strong friendship which motivates them to feel almost a kinship with the American people. And basic in all of this is the recognition by the people of Italy that "our destiny as individuals, in our family, social or political life, is safe and free only in a democracy which draws its principles from the Christian tradition."

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, as must be many of our colleagues who saw the President of Italy address the Congress, that he voiced the sentiments, aspirations, and hopes of the people of Italy who are dedicated to the ideals of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute Mr. Gronchi for his eloquent, stirring, and statesmanlike address. I am certain that the case he presented and the sincerity with which he laid it before the Congress have left a lasting and favorable impact. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that whatever we, as leaders of the free world, may continue to do to sustain the hopes, aims, and aspirations of these people, that we shall not find them wanting, that Italy shall prove itself a member in good standing of the great family of Western Democracies and a worthy friend and ally.

One Great Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 11, tens of thousands of churches throughout the United States will join in observing One Great Hour of Sharing in the 1956 United Appeal. Major Protestant denominations, working together for the eighth consecutive year through the Central Department of Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, are submitting their appeal for funds with which to carry on worldwide work of relief among the millions of homeless, hungry, and destitute in overseas areas of distress. Thirty-five major denominations cooperate through the Church World Service in humanitarian programs to aid the needy abroad. The individual and joint efforts of the churches, as projected for 1956, will require nearly $11 million in cash, in addition to many millions of pounds of United States surplus commodities and other contributed food, clothing, and medicine.

The Easter season has rightly become a time of sharing with others. I am glad to note that most Catholic churches will also observe an overseas relief emphasis on Sunday, March 11, with their response to the appeal of the Bishops' Fund, coincident with the One Great Hour of Sharing observance in Protestant churches. Furthermore, most Jewish communities are engaged in their appeal for the Passover Fund of the United Jewish Appeal.

I previously have called attention to this annual One Great Hour of Sharing, in an address I delivered at the First Methodist Church in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on February 4, 1956, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two splendid statements on the subject of the One Great Hour of Sharing and the 1956 United Appeal.

The first is an article entitled "Sharing: The Key to Peace," written by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has visited throughout the world, particularly the Far East, in studying conditions among the needy and underprivileged. This article merits the careful attention of all of us.

The second article is by Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Dr. Flemming is an eminent editor and churchman, and is ably serving the executive branch of the Government, while on leave as president of Ohio Wesleyan University. His article, entitled "Sacrificing for Freedom," is an important contribution to our thinking on the important subject of the sacrifices that we must make if freedom is to endure in the world.

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

SHARING: THE KEY TO PEACE
(By Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey)

When we consider the enormous abundance with which our country has been blessed, through the effectiveness of our American system of production, we are challenged immediately with the thought that we could and should share with suffering people in other nations of the world.

As a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee