

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3454. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of the financial affairs of labor organizations and to regulate union trusteeship and prevent the abuse thereof; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. MORTON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. HOBLITZELL, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3455. A bill to provide a limited authorization for appropriations for the construction of projects on the primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid highway systems for the fiscal year 1960 which may be immediately apportioned and would expedite the road construction program; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO TAXING INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10021) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1958, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 11, 1958:

##### IN THE COAST GUARD

Vice Adm. Alfred C. Richmond to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of vice admiral, for a term of 4 years, effective June 1, 1958. Reappointment.

Rear Adm. James A. Hirshfield to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, effective June 1, 1958. Reappointment.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1958:

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Malcolm Anderson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut for a term of 4 years.

Harry Jennings, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan for a term of 4 years.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*I Thessalonians 5: 21: Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*

Almighty God, we invoke the blessings of Thy grace and power for Thou alone art our help for each new day and our hope for every unknown tomorrow.

We beseech Thee to emancipate us from all feelings of fear and foreboding and fill our minds and hearts with that peace which the world cannot give or take away.

May our character and conduct, private and public, always find their inspiration in the great Word and spiritual principles, rather than in expediency.

Show us how we may incarnate and emulate the spirit of our blessed Lord, that spirit of compassion and consideration of love and kindness which always sought the welfare of humanity.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

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

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18 I was unavoidably detained at one of the departments and was unable to be present. I should like it to be noted that if I had been present I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 19 I am recorded as not voting. If I had been present I would have voted "yea."

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 497) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 497, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had been agreed by unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now in the bill would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

##### TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

##### Navigation

Salem Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 31, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,100,000;

Boston Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 349, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$720,000;

East Boat Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Mass.: House Document No. 168, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$360,000;

Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.: House Document No. 136, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000;

New York Harbor, N. Y.: Senate Document No. 45, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,678,000;

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: House Document No. 86, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,161,000;

Herring Creek, Md.: House Document No. 159, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$110,000;

Betterton Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 333, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$78,000;

Delaware River Anchorages: House Document No. 185, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$24,447,000;

Hull Creek, Va.: House Document No. 287, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$269,800;

Morehead City Harbor, N. C.: Senate Document No. 54, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,197,000;

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.: House Document No. 222, 85th Congress, maintenance;

Port Everglades Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 346, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,683,000;

Escambia River, Fla.: House Document No. 75, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$61,000;

Gulfport Harbor, Miss.: Senate Document No. 123, 84th Congress, maintenance;

Barataria Bay, La.: House Document No. 82, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,647,000;

Chefuncte River and Bogue Falls, La.: Senate Document No. 54, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$48,000;

Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 131, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000;

Galveston Harbor and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.: House Document No. 350, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$17,196,000;

Matagorda Ship Channel, Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 388, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,944,000;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 10, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$6,272,000;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: La Quinta Channel: Senate Document No. 33, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$954,000;

Freeport Harbor, Tex.: House Document No. 433, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$317,000;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts: House Document No. 135, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,476,000;

Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., commercial harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$246,000;

Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., small-boat harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$147,000; *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, Beaver Slough: House Document No. 345, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$241,000;

Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, report on damages: House Document No. 412, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$147,000;

Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and Lock and Dam No. 26: Senate Document No. 7, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,802,000;

Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Modification of the existing project in the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., House Document No. 33, 85th Congress;

Minnesota, River, Minn.: Senate Document No. 144, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,539,000; *Provided*, That the channel may be extended five-tenths of a mile upstream to mile 14.7 at an estimated additional cost of \$5,000;

Vermilion Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 231, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$474,000;

Ohio River at Gallipolis, Ohio: House Document No. 423, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

Licking River, Ky.: House Document No. 434, 84th Congress, maintenance;

Saxon Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 169, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$393,500;

Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 362, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

Port Washington Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 446, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,760,000; *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute 43½ percent of the total cost of the project;

St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.: Senate Document No. 95, 84th Congress, maintenance;

Old Channel of Rouge River, Mich.: House Document No. 135, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,500;

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 107, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,927,000;

Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 436, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$859,000;

Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.: House Document No. 332, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,865,000; *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

Santa Cruz Harbor, Santa Cruz, Calif.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 27, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$1,612,000;

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 8, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,800,000;

Sluslaw River, Oreg.: House Document No. 204, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,693,100;

Port Townsend Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 418, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$387,000;

Bellingham Harbor, Wash.: Senate Document No. 46, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$83,700;

Douglas and Juneau Harbors, Alaska: House Document No. 286, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,394,000;

Dillingham Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$372,000;

Naknek River, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,000;

Cook Inlet, navigation improvements, Alaska: House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,199,200;

San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico: House Document No. 38, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,476,800;

#### Beach erosion

State of Connecticut, area 9, East River to New Haven Harbor: House Document No. 395, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,000;

Connecticut shoreline, areas 8 and 11, Saugatuck River to Byram River: House Document No. 174, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$229,000;

Fire Island Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.: House Document No. 411, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,724,000;

Atlantic Coast of New Jersey, Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet: House Document No. 332, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,755,000;

Delaware Coast from Kitts Hummock to Fenwick Island, Del.: House Document No. 216, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,000;

Palm Beach County, from Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: House Document No. 342, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$222,500;

Berrien County, Mich.: House Document No. 336, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$226,000;

Manitowoc County, Wis.: House Document No. 348, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$50,000;

Fair Haven Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 134, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$114,000;

Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 138, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$404,000;

Humboldt Bay, Calif.: House Document No. 282, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,200;

Santa Cruz County, Calif.: House Document No. 179, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$516,000;

San Diego County, Calif.: House Document No. 399, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$289,000;

Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Island of Kauai, T. H.: House Document No. 432, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,000.

Sec. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them, on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects; *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted; *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

Sec. 103. That pending fulfillment of the conditions of local cooperation for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Algiers Canal, as au-

thorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for maintenance of rivers and harbors may be used for operation and maintenance of the railroad bridge over Algiers Canal for the period from September 1, 1956, to December 31, 1958.

Sec. 104. That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growth from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated additional cost for the expanded program over that now under way of \$1,350,000 annually for 5 years, of which 75 percent, presently estimated at \$1,012,500, shall be borne by the United States and 25 percent, presently estimated at \$337,500, by local interests, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as House Document No. 37, 85th Congress; *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 25 percent of the cost of the additional program; *Provided further*, That Federal funds appropriated for this project shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.

Sec. 105. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for navigation and allied purposes to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

Sec. 106. That the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 156, 82d Congress; and the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across Saint George Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 557, 82d Congress, are hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon the projects insofar as this work shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the projects adopted by the act of 1954; *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be based upon the reduction in the amount of material which will have to be removed to provide project dimensions at such time as Federal dredging of the channels is undertaken; *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto and shall not take precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority.

Sec. 107. That the improvement of Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cutoff, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for



such work as they may have done on this project, within the limits of the Federal portion of the project, over and above any items required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with project modification adopted in said act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$44,000: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations therefor and shall not have precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority: *And provided further*, That no reimbursement to local interests shall be made until they have met all the requirements of local cooperation in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress.

Sec. 108. That the Federal project structures, appurtenances, and real property of the Upper Fox River, Wis., shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the United States to any portion of the said property may, regardless of any other provision of law, be conveyed, upon such terms and conditions as may be advisable: *Provided further*, That, if the State of Wisconsin offers to take over said property under the terms and conditions hereinafter prescribed, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to said State, without monetary consideration, all such right, title, and interest of the United States in said property, and the United States shall thereafter have no further obligations with respect to the property so conveyed. In consideration of the State accepting such conveyance, and assuming responsibility for said property, there is hereby authorized to be expended from appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army toward the work of placing the project facilities in a condition suitable for public purposes, not to exceed \$300,000. The Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the States with respect to the details of the work to be performed and transfer of the property. If the State fails to present a satisfactory offer within 2 years after the date of enactment pursuant to the provisions of existing law of this act, said property may be disposed of and upon such terms and conditions as may be determined to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That, after acceptance of said property by the State of Wisconsin, the Federal laws, other than the Federal Power Act, governing the protection and preservation of navigable waters shall not apply to the reach of the Upper Fox River, Wis., above its juncture with the mouth of the Wolf River.

Sec. 109. The projects for the Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Ill., and Ind. (Calumet-Sag navigation project), authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations in House Document No. 45, 85th Congress, insofar as they apply to existing highway bridges in part I, Sag Junction to Lake Calumet, at an estimated additional cost of \$9,884,000.

Sec. 110. (a) The Secretary of the Army hereby is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States the fee simple title in and to the lands in the lake (known as Siniissippi Lake) created by the Government dam constructed across Rock River between Sterling and Rock Falls, Ill., and over which the United States now holds flowage rights or easement, and in and to all other lands upon which the United States has rights or easements used for the purpose of and appurtenant to the operation of the Federal project known as the Illinois and Mississippi Canal (which lake, canal, feeder, and appurtenances thereto are referred to

collectively in this section as the canal) in the State of Illinois; said fee simple title to be acquired subject to the continuing right of access to Siniissippi Lake by the riparian owners whose land adjoins and abuts said lake. Such acquisition may be accomplished by purchase, acceptance of donation, exchange, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or otherwise.

(b) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized out of appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, to cause the canal to be repaired and modified for the purpose of placing the same in proper condition for public recreational use other than through navigation, including (but not limited to) the repair or reconstruction of the aforesaid Government dam across Rock River; the repair or reconstruction of retaining walls, embankments, and fixed portions of the lock and dam structures, on both the feeder and the main portions of the canal; the removal of presently existing lock gates and the construction of fixed dams in lieu thereof; the repair of culverts, drainage ditches, fences, and other structures and improvements, except bridges and roads, which the United States has maintained or has been obligated to maintain; the replacement of aqueducts with inverted siphons or flumes; such other repair, renovation, or reconstruction work as the Chief of Engineers may deem necessary or advisable to prepare the canal for public recreational use other than through navigation; and the sale or other disposition of equipment, buildings, and other structures, which are designated by the State of Illinois as not suitable or needed for such use. The work of repair and modification shall be performed by the Corps of Engineers, and upon completion thereof the Chief of Engineers shall certify such completion to the Secretary of the Army. The work of repair and modification authorized in this subsection, as well as the land acquisition authorized in the preceding subsection, shall not be commenced prior to the approval by the Chief of Engineers and the responsible State representative of the agreement authorized in subsection (e) which shall include assurance from the State of Illinois that it will accept the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal. Upon such conveyance the United States shall have no further obligation with respect to the canal.

(c) Upon the request of the State of Illinois and of any corporation owning a railroad which crosses a bridge over the canal, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to said corporation, at any time before the conveyance of the canal to the State of Illinois as provided in subsection (d) of this section, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such bridge, and the delivery of any such bridge conveyance shall operate as a complete release and discharge of the United States from all further obligation with respect to such bridge. If the request also provides for the replacement of such bridge with a land fill, the Secretary of the Army further is authorized to permit the said corporation to make such replacement, but shall require adequate provision for culverts and other structures allowing passage of the waters of the canal and necessary drainage, and for right-of-way for necessary and appropriate road crossings.

(d) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized and directed, upon execution of the foregoing provisions of this section, to convey and transfer to the State of Illinois, by quitclaim deed and such other instruments as the Secretary may deem appropriate, without further consideration, the property of the canal; and to execute such other documents and to perform such other acts as shall be necessary and appropriate to complete the transfer to the said State of all right, title, and interest of the United States

in and to the canal. Upon and after the delivery of such deed, the State of Illinois is authorized, at all times, to use such quantity of water drawn from Rock River at Siniissippi Lake, as is adequate and appropriate to operate the canal for public recreational use other than through-navigation.

(e) In the execution of the provisions of this section, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the State of Illinois with respect to the details of repair and modification of the canal and the transfer thereof to the State.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2 million to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of the Government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable actual cost of such remedial work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of the date of this act, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.

Sec. 112. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Stave Island Harbor at South Goldsboro, Maine.

Short Sands section of York Beach, York County, Maine.

Tashmoo Pond, Martha's Vineyard, Mass. Sachem's Head Harbor at Guilford, Conn. Poquonock River at Groton, Conn.

Hammonds Cove, entrance to Locust Point Harbor, Long Island Sound, N. Y.

Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, and up White's Creek, Del.

Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.

Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, with a view to elimination of the water chestnut (*Trapa Natans*).

Area from Cuckold Creek through Neale Creek and Neale Sound to the Wicomico River, Charles County, Md., to determine the feasibility of providing a safe and continuous inland channel for the navigation of small boats.

Currioman Bay, Va. Tabbs Creek, Lancaster County, Va.

Wrights Creek, N. C. Savannah River, with a view to providing 9-foot navigation to Augusta, Ga.

Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte County, Fla.

Frenchman Creek, Fla.

Trinity River, Tex.

Streams and harbor facilities and needs therefor at and in the vicinity of Bayport, Fla., in the interest of present and prospective commerce and other purposes, with the view of improving the harbor facilities of Bayport as a port for commerce and for refuge on the Gulf of Mexico.

Channel from Lynn Haven Bayou, Fla., into North Bay, Fla.

Small-boat channel from the port of Panama, Fla., into Apalachee Bay, Fla.

Dredged channel, vicinity of Sunshine Skyway, Tampa Bay, Fla.

Tampa Bay, Fla., with a view to determining the feasibility of a fresh water lake at that location.

Apalachicola River Chipola Cutoff, Fla., via Wewahitchka, with a view to providing a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown.

Streams at and in the vicinity of Gulfport, Fla.

Missouri River, with a view to extending 9-foot navigation from Sioux City, Iowa, to Gavins Point Dam, S. Dak.-Nebr.

Channel from Port Inland, Mich., to deep water in Lake Michigan.

Connecting channel between Namakan Lake and Ash River, Minn.

Camp Pendleton Harbor and Oceanside, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted toward recommended beach erosion control measures at Oceanside, Calif., in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

Anaheim Bay, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

Sec. 113. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1957."

#### TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

Sec. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 733, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interest shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and prelimi-

nary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

#### *New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass.*

The project for hurricane-flood protection in the Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 59, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$15,490,000.

#### *Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts*

The project for hurricane-flood protection in the Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 230, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,180,000.

#### *Connecticut River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$24,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the construction of the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of Westfield River, Mass., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 17, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,090,000.

The project for the Mad River Dam and Reservoir on the Mad River above Winsted, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,430,000.

#### *Housatonic River Basin*

The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington and Goshen, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on the East Branch of the Naugatuck River in Torrington, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,780,000.

#### *Hudson River Basin*

The project for flood protection on the Mohawk River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 172, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,069,000.

#### *Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C.*

The project for flood protection on Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 398, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000.

#### *Savannah River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of Hartwell Reservoir, approved in the Flood Control Acts of December 22, 1944, and May 17, 1950, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 657, 78th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44,300,000.

#### *Central and southern Florida*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent acts of Congress, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the following items:

The project for canals, levees, water-control structures on the west side of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas in Hendry County, Fla., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 48, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,172,000: *Provided*, That cost sharing for the works herein authorized shall be on the same basis as that prescribed for works authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1954.

#### *Mobile River Basin*

(Tombigbee, Warrior, and Alabama-Coosa)

The project for flood control and related purposes on the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 167, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,199,000: *Provided*, That, in lieu of the cash contribution contained in item (f) of the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, local interests contribute in cash or equivalent work, the sum of \$1,585,000 in addition to other items of local cooperation.

The project for flood protection on the Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 83, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000.

#### *Lower Mississippi River*

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following items and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly:

(a) Modification of the White River Backwater project, Arkansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 26, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost, over that now authorized, of \$2,380,000 for construction and \$57,000 annually for maintenance: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall grant to the White River Drainage District of Phillips and Desha Counties, Ark., such permits, rights-of-way and easements over lands of the United States in the White River Migratory Refuge, as the Chief of Engineers may determine to be required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of this project.

(b) Modification and extension of plan of improvement in the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon Basin, Ark., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 108, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,212,000.

(c) In addition to the previous authorization, the sum of \$28,200,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement for the control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a navigation lock approved in the act of September 3, 1954.



(d) In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of \$35,874,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement in the Saint Francis River Basin approved in the act of May 17, 1950.

(e) The project for flood protection on Wolf River and tributaries, Tennessee, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 76, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,932,000.

(f) The project for Greenville Harbor, Miss., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, dated April 12, 1957, at an estimated cost of \$2,530,000: *Provided*, That the amount to be contributed by local interests shall not be in excess of 12 percent of the cost of construction, the amount of 12 percent being presently estimated at \$358,000.

The project for flood protection and related purposes on Bayou Chevreuil, La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$547,000: *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with the recommended plan as determined by the Chief of Engineers, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests.

#### *Red-Ouachita River Basin*

The general plan for flood control on Red River, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is modified and expanded, at an estimated cost in addition to that now authorized of \$53,235,000, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 170, 85th Congress, on Millwood Reservoir and Alternate Reservoirs, Little River, Oklahoma and Arkansas, except as follows:

(1) The Sherwood Reservoir on Mountain Fork River is authorized in addition to the six other reservoirs upstream from the Millwood Reservoir, recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

(2) In the case of such reservoirs, the basis for determining the cost allocated to hydroelectric power and water supply purposes shall be the incremental method of allocation whereby the cost allocated to power and water supply should be limited to the cost of adding power and water as purposes in the project, and all flood-control and land-enhancement benefits shall be non-reimbursable.

#### *Gulf of Mexico*

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Galveston Bay, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Texas City, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 325, 85th Congress at an estimated cost of \$6,166,000.

#### *Arkansas River Basin*

The project for the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 325, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,628,000.

The first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma", approved July 6, 1954 (88 Stat. 450), is amended by inserting after "as recommended by the Chief of Engineers," the following: "or such additional flood storage or pool elevations, or both, as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers."

#### *White River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the sum of \$57

million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the White River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Lone Rock Reservoir and the addition of Gilbert Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes as recommended by the district engineer in House Document No. 499, 83d Congress.

#### *Pecos River Basin*

The project for flood protection on the Pecos River at Carlsbad, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 224, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$2,066,000.

#### *Rio Grande Basin*

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at Socorro, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 58, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$3,152,000.

#### *Upper Mississippi River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$21 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the upper Mississippi River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection on the Rock and Green Rivers, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 173, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,996,000.

The project for flood protection on Eau Galle River at Spring Valley, Wis., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 52, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,690,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at Winona, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 324, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,620,000.

The projects for flood protection on the Mississippi River, at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 223, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,705,500.

The project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 437, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,870,000.

The project for the Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 9, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44,500,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1957, at an estimated cost of \$23 million.

The project for flood protection on the Root River at Rushford, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 431, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$796,000.

#### *Great Lakes Basin*

The project for flood protection on the Bad River at Mellen and Odanah, Wis., is hereby

authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 165, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Kalamazoo, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,358,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 132, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,825,000.

The project for flood protection on the Saginaw River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 346, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,085,000.

The project for flood protection on Owasco Outlet, tributary of Oswego River, at Auburn, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 133, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$305,000.

#### *Missouri River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, is authorized and directed to undertake the construction and to provide suitable sewer facilities, conforming to applicable standards of the South Dakota Department of Health, to replace certain existing water or sewer facilities of the St. Joseph's Indian School, Chamberlain, S. Dak., by facilities to provide for treatment of sewage or connection to the city system not exceeding \$42,000 in cost: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this section out of any sums appropriated for the construction of the Oahe and Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir projects, Missouri River.

The project for flood protection on the Sun River, at Great Falls, Mont., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 343, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,405,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cannonball River, at Mott, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 35, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$434,000.

The project for flood protection on the Floyd River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 417, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,060,000.

The project for flood protection on the Black Vermillion River at Frankfort, Kans., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 409, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

The project for flood protection in the Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 139, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,214,000.

The project for flood control on Salt Creek and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 396, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,314,000.

The project for flood protection on Shell Creek, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 187, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,025,000.

#### *Red River of the North Basin*

The project for flood protection on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 141, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$632,000.

#### *Ohio River Basin*

The project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 316, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,970,000: *Provided*, That in lieu of the cash contribution recommended by the Chief of Engineers, local interests contribute in cash, the sum of \$233,000, in addition to other items of local cooperation.

The project for the upper Wabash River and tributaries, Ind., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Brush Creek at Princeton, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 122, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

The project for flood protection on Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$708,000.

The project for flood protection on Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River at Jamestown, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 103, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,796,000.

The project for flood protection on the west branch of the Mahoning River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 191, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,585,000.

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, at and in the vicinity of Washington, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 286, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,286,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Brookville, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 166, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,188,000.

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin is modified to provide for a reservoir at the Monroe Reservoir site, mile 25.6, on Salt Creek, White River Basin, Ind., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 192, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,359,000.

#### *Sacramento River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$17 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection on the Sacramento River from Chico Landing to Red

Bluff, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 272, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,560,000.

#### *Eel River Basin*

The project for flood protection on the Eel River in the Sandy Prairie region, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 80, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$707,000.

#### *Weber River Basin, Utah*

The project for flood protection on the Weber River and tributaries, Utah, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 158, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$520,000.

#### *San Joaquin River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$13 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,900,000: *Provided*, That, prior to starting construction, assurances of repayment arrangements for the cost allocated to irrigation be obtained by the Secretary of the Interior.

The project for the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,500,000: *Provided*, That prior to starting construction assurances of repayment arrangements for the cost allocated to irrigation be obtained by the Secretary of the Interior.

#### *Kaweah and Tule River Basins*

In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$28 million.

#### *Los Angeles River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$44 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

#### *Santa Ana River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$8 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

#### *San Dieguito River Basin*

The project for the San Dieguito River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 288, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,961,000.

#### *Columbia River Basin*

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$112 million for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, and September 3, 1954.

In carrying out the review of House Document No. 531, 81st Congress, 2d session, and

other reports on the Columbia River and its tributaries, pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate dated July 28, 1955, the Chief of Engineers shall be guided by flood-control goals not less than those contained in said House Document No. 531.

#### *Sammamish River Basin*

The project for flood protection and related purposes on the Sammamish River, Wash., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$825,000.

#### *Territory of Alaska*

The project for flood protection on Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,727,000.

The project for flood protection at Cook Inlet, Alaska (Talkeetna), is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$60,000.

SEC. 204. That, in recognition of the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose Oroville Dam and Reservoir, proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such dam and reservoir and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with the State of California, subject to a finding by the Secretary of the Army, approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Department of the Army and the State of California shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the Oroville Dam in such manner as will produce the flood-control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the dam for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890): *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army in a manner which shall assure that the annual Federal contribution during the project construction period does not exceed the percentage of the annual expenditure for the Oroville Dam and Reservoir which the total flood-control contribution bears to the total cost of the dam and reservoir: *And provided further*, That unless construction of the Oroville Dam and Reservoir is undertaken within 4 years from the date of enactment of this act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

SEC. 205. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose projects.

(b) In prosecuting plans and projects for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes heretofore or hereafter authorized, storage may be included in any reservoir project constructed or to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers without reimbursement to increase low flows downstream to the extent warranted at that time, or antici-



pated to be warranted at that time, or anticipated to be warranted during the economic life of the project, by widespread, general, and nonexclusive benefits from such increases in low flow.

(c) In carrying out the policy set forth in this section, it is hereby provided that storage may also be included in any reservoir project surveyed, planned, constructed or to be planned, surveyed and/or constructed by the Corps of Engineers to impound water for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water, or water for other beneficial community use, and the reasonable value thereof may be taken into account in estimating the economic value of the entire project: *Provided*, That when contract for the use of such impounded waters is made it shall be on the basis that will provide equitable reimbursement to the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not be construed to modify the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890).

SEC. 206. (a) In order to provide adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Grapevine, Garza-Little Elm, Benbrook, Belton, and Whitney Reservoir projects in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real estate requirements of the projects the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof whenever he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided, subject to the following limitations:

(1) No reconveyance shall be made if within 30 days after the last date that notice of the proposed reconveyance has been published by the Secretary in a local newspaper, an objection in writing is received by the former owner and the Secretary from a present record owner of land abutting a portion of the reservoir made available for reconveyance, unless within 90 days after receipt by the former owner and the Secretary of such notice of objection, the present record owner of land and the former owner involved indicate to the Secretary that agreement has been reached concerning the reconveyance.

(2) If no agreement is reached between the present record owner of land and the former owner within 90 days after notice of objection has been filed with the former owner and the Secretary, the land made available for reconveyance in accordance with this section shall be reported to the Administrator of General Services for disposal in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377).

(3) No lands heretofore conveyed to the United States Government by the city of Dallas in connection with the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir project shall be subject to re-vestment of title to private owners, but shall remain subject to the terms and conditions of the instrument or instruments of conveyance which transferred the title to the United States Government.

(b) Any such reconveyance of any such land or interests shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as regulations prescribe to the former owner of such land or interests, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interests from such former owner in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

(c) Any reconveyance of land therein made under this section shall be subject to

such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest, except that no mineral rights may be reserved in said lands unless the Secretary finds that such reservation is needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir projects designated in this section.

(d) Any land reconveyed under this section shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the reservoir projects specified in subsection (a) of this section), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

(f) As used in this section the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land, or interests therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children, or the heirs at law; and the term "present record owner of land" shall mean the person or persons in whose name such land shall, on the date of approval of this act, be recorded on the deed records of the respective county in which such land is located.

(g) The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this section to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

(h) Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(i) This section shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Streams, river basins, and areas in New York and New Jersey for flood control, major

drainage, navigation, channel improvement, and land reclamation, as follows: Hackensack River, Passaic River, Raritan River, Arthur Kill, and Kill Van Kull, including the portions of these river basins in Bergen, Hudson, Essex, Middlesex, Passaic, Union, and Monmouth Counties, N. J.

Deep Creek, Saint Marys County, Md.

Mills Creek, Fla.

Streams in Seminole County, Fla., draining into the Saint Johns River.

Streams in Brevard County, Fla., draining Indian River and adjacent coastal areas, including Merritt Island; and the area of Turnbull Hammock in Volusia County.

Lake Ponchartrain, La., in the interest of protecting Salt Bayou Road.

San Felipe Creek, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Del Rio, Tex.

El Paso, El Paso County, Tex.

Rio Grande and tributaries, at and in the vicinity of Fort Hancock, Hudspeth County, Tex.

Missouri River Basin, S. Dak., with reference to utilization of floodwaters stored in authorized reservoirs for purposes of municipal and industrial use and maintenance of natural lake levels.

Stump Creek, tributary of North Fork of Mahoning Creek, at Sykesville, Pa.

Little River and Cayuga Creek, at and in the vicinity of Cayuga Island, Niagara County, N. Y.

Bird, Caney, and Verdigris Rivers, Okla., and Kans.

Watersheds of the Illinois River, at and in the vicinity of Chicago, Ill., the Chicago River, Ill., the Calumet River, Ill. and Ind., and their tributaries, and any areas in northeast Illinois and northwest Indiana which drain directly into Lake Michigan with respect to flood control and major drainage problems.

All streams, flowing into Lake Saint Clair and Detroit River in Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne Counties, Mich.

Sacramento River Basin, Calif., with reference to cost allocation studies for Oroville Dam.

Pescadero Creek, Calif.

Soquel Creek, Calif.

San Gregorio Creek and tributaries, California.

Redwood Creek, San Mateo, Calif.

Streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif.

Streams at and in the vicinity of South San Francisco, Calif.

Streams at and in the vicinity of Burlingame, Calif.

Kellogg and Marsh Creeks, Contra Costa County, Calif.

Eastkoot Creek, Stinson Beach area, Marin County, Calif.

Rodeo Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

Pinole Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

Rogue River, Ore., in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and allied purposes.

Kihei District, Island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 208. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9 (a) of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 209. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for flood control and allied purposes, to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in

the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

Sec. 210. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1957".

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. My understanding is that this amendment provides for the inclusion in the bill of the 19 projects which were approved last week?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct and this is the first opportunity we have to give an explanation of them.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered to S. 497 is briefly this: It includes S. 497 as amended and as debated for 2 hours on the floor yesterday afternoon. S. 497, which was before the House yesterday was a Senate bill, as revised and amended by the House Committee on Public Works and reported out of that committee last August 1957. The bill was then not scheduled on the agenda for floor action until just recently, when a week or so ago we appeared before the Rules Committee. During those intervening 6 months 19 projects have come to the Public Works Committee, which have been approved by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget in all cases except three and one minor one. Nineteen were approved by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. In those three exceptions economic justifications were most favorable. The committee felt that only in fairness to the authors of the projects and to the areas and communities desiring and needing those projects, that the committee hear and review them, which they did. They heard reports from the Corps of Engineers and reports from the Bureau of the Budget, and adopted them. So, S. 497 as before the House now is identical with the bill which was debated yesterday, plus those 19 projects which I will summarize by categories briefly, and then I will be glad to answer any questions that anyone may desire to ask about any particular project in detail.

Those 19 projects were divided as follows: 12 were in title I, rivers and harbors. Of those 12, 8 are for navigation, totaling approximately \$32,500,000. Four were beach erosion, \$7,241,000.

In title II went 7 of these projects, 4 for flood control, \$10,357,000, and 3 new types of project, hurricane-flood control, \$37,836,000. So we have an overall sum of \$87,990,000 added to the approximate authorization in yesterday's bill of \$1,456,000,000.

So, briefly, Mr. Chairman, this is the substance of the amendment which has

been offered to S. 497. I will be pleased to answer any questions with reference to any of the problems.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I wish to serve notice that I shall object to any requests for extension of time under the 5-minute rule on both sides, proponents and opponents.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the substitute that has been offered, what provision has been made for the protection of the water rights of those States which have different water rights than the riparian rights? In other words, an appropriation system that is recognized in the western part of the United States. Is there any protection to those States that their own State water laws will be complied with?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi who is a member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In the substitute only the items which have been approved by the full committee are included. The bill has protection for those water rights. There might be a difference of opinion about it, but the question is involved and can be taken up with regard to an amendment to section 205. As I understand it, there are several proposed amendments that will be offered in regard to section 205, when we get to that point.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, Senate bill 497 is a combined omnibus river and harbor and flood-control measure, title I dealing with river and harbor and beach erosion control authorizations, and title II dealing with flood-control authorizations. The last general authorization bill was the act approved September 3, 1954. Since that time many reports have been submitted by the Corps of Engineers to the Congress. These reports deserve early action because of the importance and urgency of the problems involved. In addition, a number of major river basin authorizations have been reduced by appropriations to a point where additional monetary authorization is needed to carry on the comprehensive plan for flood control navigation, and other purposes as originally approved by the Congress. There are also several matters concerning general legislation and modification of previous project authorization which should be considered at this time.

The civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers constitutes a major portion of the Federal plan for developing the Nation's water resources. From a modest beginning over a century ago the scope of the work has been enlarged to meet the continually growing demands

of an expanding population for water uses.

Beginning with a \$75,000 appropriation in 1824 for snagging and clearing the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, the program has grown during the ensuing 132 years until today it constitutes a multi-million dollar activity, with over 3,000 projects in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions. The work embraces projects for the improvement of the Nation's rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, hydropower, and related purposes.

Navigation improvements at coastal and Great Lakes harbors generally involve the dredging of channels and anchorages, and frequently the protection of entrances by jetties and the creation of protected areas by breakwaters. Rivers are improved for navigation by clearing and snagging, dredging, construction of regulating works, and canalization by locks and dams. Flood control is accomplished by improving the channels of streams to increase carrying capacity, by creation of diversion channels, by construction of reservoirs for storage or detention of flood flows, and by levee and flood-wall construction for protection of areas subject to damage. Projects for beach erosion control entail principally restoration of damaged areas by artificial placement of sandfill and construction of seawalls, groins and similar structures to prevent further damage and induce beach replenishment.

The importance of the system of inland waterways is indicated by the vast annual increase in the tonnage and in the variety of commodities that move over these waterways. For each ton of freight that uses the improved inland waterways there is returned to the Nation as a general benefit a saving in transportation costs. While these savings may be considered as a prime factor in the use of the system of inland waterways, I believe that another factor just as important is that the improved waterways have to a large extent been responsible for the growth and the development of the interior sectors of the country. Low-cost water transportation has enabled the movement of products from the mines, forests, and the farms to a widespread consuming area. It has also enabled the distribution, at low cost, of semifinished and finished products from industrial communities that have been established on these waterways to the consumers spread over almost the entire Nation. The importance of our improved ports cannot be overemphasized, both in times of peace and in times of national emergencies. The large ports serve their purposes in national and international commerce. The smaller ports, from which the benefits are more of a domestic nature, play a very vital part in the economic life of the country. These ports have frequently been constructed in the interests of the fishing industry which serves to supply the Nation with low-cost seafood products, and to serve as harbors of refuge and ports for recreational craft.

In turning to the flood-control program, I want to emphasize that the



accomplishments of the flood-control program have more than justified its cost. The projects in full or partial operation are preventing flood damages of one-half billion dollars a year and in addition producing related benefits of one-fourth billion dollars a year. This total annual value of three-fourths billion dollars a year is being achieved at a cost of slightly more than \$200 million a year. The flood-control program is paying off at the rate of more than \$3 from each \$1 invested and this does not take into account the values which cannot be measured in monetary terms such as the saving in life and the economic security of hundreds of urban communities and farming areas.

I recognize that much is still to be done in the field of flood-damage prevention. The potential flood losses in the United States in the main river valleys and the major tributaries would amount to \$900 million a year if there were no flood-control works. The reduction of one-half billion dollars a year in flood damage being achieved by flood-control works now in operation still leaves a balance of \$400 million of annual average loss. The projects included in this title represent a long stride along the road toward adequate protection of the lives and property of the American people from devastating floods.

I want to report that there is an urgent need for this bill at this time. Many of the projects, river-basin authorizations, and other items were needed last year, and the passing of a year has made it more important that they be authorized as soon as possible. Further delay will result in additional monetary losses. For example the proposed project for a navigation dam across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., to increase the navigable depths during low water is one on which there is complete agreement on the need for authorization as an emergency measure. Many others are in the same category.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important projects in this bill provides a plan of recommended improvement for the Baltimore harbor and channels, Maryland and Virginia in accordance with the report of the Engineers set forth in House Document 86, 85th Congress. The project, as approved by the Committee on Public Works, provides for a channel 41 feet in depth over the existing 39-foot waterway with a realignment at Rappahannock Shoal and increases in width from 600 to 800 feet in those sections applicable; an increased depth in the connecting channel to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to 35 feet and width of 600 feet; and increased depths in certain branch channels to 41 feet. The recommendations of the Engineers as adopted by the committee also provide that, when local interests dredge certain areas of the northwest branch to 39 feet, they will be maintained by the Federal Government.

I call attention to the high economic ratio of this project—4.95—which is unusually high. Commerce at the port of Baltimore is increasing very rapidly and it is vitally important from a national defense standpoint. The project is

needed to accommodate larger vessels and to provide for expansion of port facilities.

I want to emphasize that this is the proper time to consider an omnibus bill, and that any delay in enacting this legislation would have unfortunate results in the retardation of projects which are urgently needed for the protection of lives and property, for the improvement of the Nation's waterways, and for the general enhancement of the national economy.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington as a substitute for the Blatnik amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"Sec. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

"Navigation

"Salem Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 31, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,100,000;

"Boston Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 349, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$720,000;

"East Boat Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Mass.: House Document No. 168, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$360,000;

"Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.: House Document No. 136, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000;

"New York Harbor, N. Y.: Senate Document No. 45, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,678,000;

"Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: House Document No. 86, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,161,000;

"Herring Creek, Md.: House Document No. 159, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$110,000;

"Berterton Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 333, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$78,000;

"Delaware River Anchorages: House Document No. 185, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$24,447,000;

"Hull Creek, Va.: House Document No. 287, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$269,800;

"Morehead City Harbor, N. C.: Senate Document No. 54, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,197,000;

"Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.: House Document No. 222, 85th Congress, maintenance;

"Port Everglades Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 346, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,683,000;

"Escambia River, Fla.: House Document No. 75, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$61,000;

"Gulfport Harbor, Miss.: Senate Document No. 123, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Barataria Bay, La.: House Document No. 82, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,647,000;

"Chefunct River and Bogue Falls, La.: Senate Document No. 54, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$48,000;

"Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 131, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000;

"Galveston Harbor and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.: House Document No. 350, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$17,196,000;

"Matagorda Ship Channel, Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 388, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,944,000;

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 10, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$6,272,000;

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., La Quinta Channel: Future maintenance in accordance with Senate Document No. 33, 85th Congress: *Provided*, That local interests shall not be reimbursed for funds contributed for this improvement;

"Freeport Harbor, Tex.: House Document No. 433, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$317,000;

"Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts: House Document No. 135, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,476,000;

"Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., commercial harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$246,000;

"Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., small-boat harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$62,000: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

"Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, Beaver Slough: House Document No. 345, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$241,000;

"Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, report on damages: House Document No. 412, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$147,000;

"Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam No. 26: Senate Document No. 7, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,802,000;

"Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Modification of the existing project in the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., House Document No. 33, 85th Congress;

"Minnesota River, Minn.: Senate Document No. 144, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,539,000: *Provided*, That the channel may be extended five-tenths of a mile upstream to mile 14.7 at an estimated additional cost of \$5,000;

"Vermilion Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 231, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$474,000;

"Ohio River at Gallipolis, Ohio: House Document No. 423, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

"Licking River, Ky.: House Document No. 434, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Saxon Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 169, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$393,500;

"Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 362, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

"Port Washington Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 446, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,760,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute 43½ percent of the total cost of the project;

"St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.: Senate Document No. 95, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Old Channel of Rouge River, Mich.: House Document No. 135, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,500;

"Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 107, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,927,000;

"Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 436, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$859,000;

"Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.: House Document No. 332, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,865,000: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

"Santa Cruz Harbor, Santa Cruz, Calif.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 27, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$1,612,000;

"Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 8, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,800,000;

"Siuslaw River, Oreg.: House Document No. 204, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,693,100;

"Port Townsend Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 418, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$387,000;

"Bellingham Harbor, Wash.: Senate Document No. 46, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$83,700;

"Douglas and Juneau Harbors, Alaska: House Document No. 286, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,394,000;

"Dillingham Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$372,000;

"Naknek River, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,000;

"Cook Inlet, navigation improvements, Alaska: House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,199,200;

"San Juan Harbor, P. R.: House Document No. 38, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,476,800;

#### "Beach erosion

"State of Connecticut, area 9, East River to New Haven Harbor: House Document No. 395, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,000;

"Connecticut shoreline, areas 8 and 11, Saugatuck River to Byram River: House Document No. 174, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$229,000;

"Fire Island Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.: House Document No. 411, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,724,000;

"Atlantic coast of New Jersey, Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet: House Document No. 332, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,755,000;

"Delaware coast from Kitts Hummock to Fenwick Island, Del.: House Document No. 216, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,000;

"Palm Beach County, from Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: House Document No. 342, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$222,500;

"Berrien County, Mich.: House Document No. 336, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$226,000;

"Manitowoc County, Wis.: House Document No. 348, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$50,000;

"Fair Haven Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 134, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$114,000;

"Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 138, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$404,000;

"Humboldt Bay, Calif.: House Document No. 282, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,200;

"Santa Cruz County, Calif.: House Document No. 179, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$516,000;

"San Diego County, Calif.: House Document No. 399, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$289,000;

"Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii: House Document No. 432, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,000.

"Sec. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them, on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

"Sec. 103. That pending fulfillment of the conditions of local cooperation for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Algiers Canal, as authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for maintenance of rivers and harbors may be used for operation and maintenance of the railroad bridge over Algiers Canal for the period from September 1, 1956, to December 31, 1958.

"Sec. 104. That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated additional cost for the expanded program over that now under way of \$1,350,000 annually for 5 years, of which 50 percent, presently estimated at \$675,000, shall be borne by the United States and 50 percent, presently estimated at \$675,000, by local interests, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as House Document No. 37, 85th Congress: *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of the additional program: *Provided further*, That Federal funds appropriated for this project shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.

"Sec. 105. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for navigation and allied purposes to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

"Sec. 106. That the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 156, 82d Congress; and the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across Saint George Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 557, 82d Congress, are hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon the projects insofar as this work shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the projects adopted by the act of 1954: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be based upon the reduction in the amount of

material which will have to be removed to provide project dimensions at such time as Federal dredging of the channels is undertaken: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto and shall not take precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority.

"Sec. 107. That the improvement of Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cutoff, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done on this project, within the limits of the Federal portion of the project, over and above any items required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with project modification adopted in said act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$44,000: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations therefor and shall not have precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority: *And provided further*, That no reimbursement to local interests shall be made until they have met all the requirements of local cooperation in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress.

"Sec. 108. That the Federal project structures, appurtenances, and real property of the Upper Fox River, Wis., shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the United States to any portion of the said property may, regardless of any other provision of law, be conveyed, upon such terms and conditions as may be advisable: *Provided further*, That, if the State of Wisconsin offers to take over said property under the terms and conditions hereinafter prescribed, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quit-claim deed to said State, without monetary consideration, all such right, title, and interest of the United States in said property, and the United States shall thereafter have no further obligations with respect to the property so conveyed. In consideration of the State accepting such conveyance and assuming responsibility for said property, there is hereby authorized to be expended from appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army toward the work of placing the project facilities in a condition suitable for public purposes, not to exceed \$300,000. The Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the State with respect to the details of the work to be performed and transfer of the property. If the State fails to present a satisfactory offer within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, said property may be disposed of pursuant to the provisions of existing law and upon such terms and conditions as may be determined to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That, after acceptance of said property by the State of Wisconsin, the Federal laws, other than the Federal Power Act, governing the protection and preservation of navigable waters shall not apply to the reach of the Upper Fox River, Wis., above its juncture with the mouth of the Wolf River.

"Sec. 109. The project for the Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Ill., and Ind. (Calumet-Sag navigation project), authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations in House Document No. 45, 85th Congress, insofar as they apply to existing highway bridges in



part I, Sag Junction to Lake Calumet, at an estimated additional cost of \$9,884,000.

"Sec. 110 (a) The Secretary of the Army hereby is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States the fee simple title in and to the lands in the lake (known as Sinnissippi Lake) created by the Government dam constructed across Rock River between Sterling and Rock Falls, Ill., and over which the United States now holds flowage rights or easement, and in and to all other lands upon which the United States has rights or easements used for the purpose of and appurtenant to the operation of the Federal project known as the Illinois and Mississippi Canal (which lake, canal, feeder, and appurtenances thereto are referred to collectively in this section as the canal) in the State of Illinois; said fee simple title to be acquired subject to the continuing right of access to Sinnissippi Lake by the riparian owners whose land adjoins and abuts said lake. Such acquisition may be accomplished by purchase, acceptance of donation, exchange, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or otherwise.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized out of appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, to cause the canal to be repaired and modified for the purpose of placing the same in proper condition for public recreational use other than through-navigation, including (but not limited to) the repair or reconstruction of the aforesaid Government dam across Rock River; the repair or reconstruction of retaining walls, embankments, and fixed portions of the lock and dam structures, on both the feeder and the main portions of the canal; the removal of presently existing lock gates and the construction of fixed dams in lieu thereof; the repair of culverts, drainage ditches, fences, and other structures and improvements, except bridges and roads, which the United States has maintained or has been obligated to maintain; the replacement of aqueducts with inverted siphons, or flumes; such other repair, renovation, or reconstruction work as the Chief of Engineers may deem necessary or advisable to prepare the canal for public recreational use other than through-navigation; and the sale or other disposition of equipment, buildings, and other structures, which are designated by the State of Illinois as not suitable or needed for such use. The work of repair and modification shall be performed by the Corps of Engineers, and upon completion thereof the Chief of Engineers shall certify such completion to the Secretary of the Army. The work of repair and modification authorized in this subsection, as well as the land acquisition authorized in the preceding subsection, shall not be commenced prior to the approval by the Chief of Engineers and the responsible State representative of the agreement authorized in subsection (e) which shall include assurance from the State of Illinois that it will accept the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal. Upon such conveyance the United States shall have no further obligation with respect to the canal.

"(c) Upon the request of the State of Illinois and of any corporation owning a railroad which crosses a bridge over the canal, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to said corporation, at any time before the conveyance of the canal to the State of Illinois as provided in subsection (d) of this section, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such bridge, and the delivery of any such bridge conveyance shall operate as a complete release and discharge of the United States from all further obligation with respect to such bridge. If the request also provides for the replacement of such bridge with a land fill, the Secretary of the Army further is authorized to permit the said corporation to make such replace-

ment, but shall require adequate provision for culverts and other structures allowing passage of the waters of the canal and necessary drainage, and for right-of-way for necessary and appropriate road crossings.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized and directed, upon execution of the foregoing provisions of this section, to convey and transfer to the State of Illinois, by quitclaim deed and such other instruments as the Secretary may deem appropriate, without further consideration, the property of the canal; and to execute such other documents and to perform such other acts as shall be necessary and appropriate to complete the transfer to the said State of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal. Upon and after the delivery of such deed, the State of Illinois is authorized, at all times, to use such quantity of water drawn from Rock River at Sinnissippi Lake, as is adequate and appropriate to operate the canal for public recreational use other than through-navigation.

"(e) In the execution of the provisions of this section, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the State of Illinois with respect to the details of repair and modification of the Canal and the transfer thereof to the State.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2 million to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of the Government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable actual cost of such remedial work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of the date of this act, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.

"Sec. 112. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Stave Island Harbor at South Goldsboro, Maine.

"Short Sands Section of York Beach, York County, Maine.

"Tashmoo Pond, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.

"Sachem's Head Harbor at Guilford, Conn.

"Poquonock River at Groton, Conn.

"Hammonds Cove, entrance to Locust Point Harbor, Long Island Sound, N. Y.

"Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, and up White's Creek, Del.

"Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.

"Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, with a view to elimination of the water chestnut (*Trapa Natans*).

"Area from Cuckold Creek through Neale Creek and Neale Sound to the Wicomico River, Charles County, Md., to determine the feasibility of providing a safe and continuous inland channel for the navigation of small boats.

"Currioman Bay, Va.

"Tabbs Creek, Lancaster County, Va.

"Wrights Creek, N. C.

"Savannah River, with a view to providing 9-foot navigation to Augusta, Ga.

"Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte County, Fla.

"Frenchman Creek, Fla.

"Trinity River, Tex.

"Streams and harbor facilities and needs therefor at and in the vicinity of Bayport, Fla., in the interest of present and prospective commerce and other purposes, with the view of improving the harbor facilities of Bayport as a port for commerce and for refuge on the Gulf of Mexico.

"Channel from Lynn Haven Bayou, Fla., into North Bay, Fla.

"Small-boat channel from the port of Panacea, Fla., into Apalachee Bay, Fla.

"Dredged channel, vicinity of Sunshine Skyway, Tampa Bay, Fla.

"Tampa Bay, Fla., with a view to determining the feasibility of a fresh water lake at that location.

"Apalachicola River Chipola Cutoff, Fla., via Wewahitchka, with a view to providing a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

"Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of Gulfport, Fla.

"Missouri River, with a view to extending 9-foot navigation from Sioux City, Iowa, to Gavins Point Dam, South Dakota-Nebraska.

"Channel from Port Inland, Mich., to deep water in Lake Michigan.

"Connecting channel between Namakan Lake and Ash River, Minn.

"Camp Pendleton Harbor and Oceanside, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted toward recommended beach erosion control measures at Oceanside, Calif., in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

"Anaheim Bay, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

"Sec. 113. Title I may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1957.'

#### "TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"Sec. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interest shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act,

and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

*"New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass.*

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 59, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$15,490,000.

*"Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts*

"The project for hurricane-flood protection in the Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 230, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,180,000.

*"Connecticut River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$24 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the construction of the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of Westfield River, Mass., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 17, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,090,000.

"The project for the Mad River Dam and Reservoir on the Mad River above Winsted, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,430,000.

*"Housatonic River Basin*

"The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington and Goshen, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

"The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on the East Branch of the Naugatuck River in Torrington, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

neers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,780,000.

*"Hudson River Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Mohawk River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 172, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,069,000: *Provided*, That the works at Rome, N. Y., shall not be constructed until a report showing economic justification has been completed by the Chief of Engineers.

*"Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C.*

"The project for flood protection on Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 398, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000.

*"Savannah River basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of Hartwell Reservoir, approved in the Flood Control Acts of December 22, 1944, and May 17, 1950, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 657, 78th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44.3 million.

*"Central and southern Florida*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent acts of Congress, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for canals, levees, water control structures on the west side of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas in Hendry County, Florida, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 48, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,172,000.

*"Mobile River basin*

*"(Tombigbee, Warrior, and Alabama-Coosa)*

"The project for flood control and related purposes on the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 167, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,445,400.

"The project for flood protection on the Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 83, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1.3 million.

*"Lower Mississippi River*

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following items and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly:

"(a) Modification of the White River backwater project, Arkansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 26, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost, over that now authorized, of \$1,613,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall grant to the White River Drainage District of Phillips and Desha Counties, Ark., such permits, rights-of-way, and easements over lands of the United States in the White River Migratory Refuge, as the Chief of Engineers may determine to be required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of this project: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the requirements for local coopera-

tion recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 31.2 percent of the cost of the project in cash or equivalent work, and to operate and maintain the pumping plant after completion.

"(b) Modification and extension of plans of improvement in the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon Basin, Ark., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 108, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$631,000: *Provided*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 48 percent of the cost of providing major drainage in cash or equivalent work, to furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, and to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works.

"(c) In addition to the previous authorization, the sum of \$28,200,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement for the control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a navigation lock approved in the act of September 3, 1954.

"(d) In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of \$35,674,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement in the St. Francis River Basin approved in the act of May 17, 1950.

"(e) The project for flood protection on Wolf River and tributaries, Tennessee, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 76, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,932,000.

"(f) The project for flood protection and related purposes on Bayou Chevreuil, La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$547,000: *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with the recommended plan as determined by the Chief of Engineers, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests.

*"Red-Ouachita River Basin*

"The general plan for flood control on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is modified and expanded, at an estimated cost in addition to that now authorized of \$53,235,000, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 170, 85th Congress, on Millwood Reservoir and Alternate Reservoirs, Little River, Okla. and Ark.

*"Gulf of Mexico*

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Galveston Bay, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Texas City, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 85th Congress at an estimated cost of \$6,166,000.

*"Arkansas River Basin*

"The project for the Trinidad Dam on Fur gatoire River, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 325, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,628,000.

"The first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma,' approved July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), is amended by inserting after 'as recommended by the Chief of Engineers,' the following: 'or such additional flood storage or pool elevations, or both, as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.'



*"White River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the sum of \$45,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the White River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

*"Pecos River Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Pecos River at Carlsbad, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 224, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,792,000.

*"Rio Grande Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at Socorro, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 58, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$3,103,000.

*"Upper Mississippi River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$21,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the upper Mississippi River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

"The project for flood protection on the Rock and Green Rivers, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 173, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,996,000.

"The project for flood protection on Eau Galle River at Spring Valley, Wis., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 52, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,690,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at Winona, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 324, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$1,620,000.

"The projects for flood protection on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 223, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,705,500.

"The project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 437, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$1,870,000.

"The project for the Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 9, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40 million: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash 10 percent of the cost of the project in recognition of the water supply benefits of the project.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1957, at an estimated cost of \$23 million: *Provided*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute in cash or equivalent work a percentage of the cost of Carlyle Reservoir and Levee Districts 3, 4, 8, 10, and 13, calculated on the same basis as cost sharing for the other projects recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers.

"The project for flood protection on the Root River at Rushford, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by

the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 431, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$796,000.

*"Great Lakes Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Bad River at Mellen and Odanah, Wis., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 165, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Kalamazoo, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,358,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 132, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,825,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Saginaw River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 346, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,085,000.

"The project for flood protection on Oswego Outlet, tributary of Oswego River, at Auburn, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 133, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$305,000.

*"Missouri River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress: *Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to any dam in such plan to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, an equitable proportion of such power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed.

"The project for flood protection on the Sun River, at Great Falls, Mont., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 343, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,405,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Cannonball River, at Mott, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 35, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$434,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Floyd River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 417, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,060,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Black Vermillion River at Frankfort, Kans., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 409, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

"The project for flood protection in the Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 139, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,214,000.

"The project for flood control on Salt Creek and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No.

396, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,314,000.

"The project for flood protection on Shell Creek, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 187, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,025,000.

*"Red River of the North Basin*

"The project for flood protection on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 141, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$632,000.

*"Ohio River Basin*

"The project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 316, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,272,000.

"The project for the upper Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on Brush Creek at Princeton, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 122, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

"The project for flood protection on Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$708,000.

"The project for flood protection on Lake Chautauque and Chadakoin River at Jamestown, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 103, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,796,000.

"The project for flood protection on the west branch of the Mahoning River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 191, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,585,000.

"The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, at and in the vicinity of Washington, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 286, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,286,000.

"The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Brookville, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 166, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,188,000.

"The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin is modified to provide for a reservoir at the Monroe Reservoir site, mile 25.6, on Salt Creek, White River Basin, Ind., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 192, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,359,000.

*"Sacramento River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$17 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

"The project for flood protection on the Sacramento River from Chico Landing to Red Bluff, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 272, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,560,000.

*"Eel River Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Eel River in the Sandy Prairie region, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 80, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$707,000.

*"Weber River Basin, Utah*

"The project for flood protection on the Weber River and tributaries, Utah, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 158, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$520,000.

*"San Joaquin River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$13 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

*"Kaweah and Tule River Basins*

"In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$28 million.

*"Los Angeles River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$44 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress.

*"Santa Ana River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$8 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress.

*"San Dieguito River Basin*

"The project for the San Dieguito River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 288, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,961,000.

*"Columbia River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$112 million, for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, and September 3, 1954.

"In carrying out the review of House Document No. 531, 81st Congress, second session, and other reports on the Columbia River and its tributaries, pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate dated July 28, 1955, the Chief of Engineers shall be guided by flood control goals not less than those contained in said House Document No. 531.

*"Sammamish River Basin*

"The projects for flood protection and related purposes on the Sammamish River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$825,000.

*"Territory of Alaska*

"The project for flood protection on Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,727,000.

"The project for flood protection at Cook Inlet, Alaska (Talkeetna), is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$60,000.

"Sec. 204. That, in recognition of the flood-control accomplishments of the multi-purpose Oroville Dam and Reservoir, proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such dam and reservoir and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with the State of California, subject to a finding by the Secretary of the Army, approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Department of the Army and the State of California shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the Oroville Dam in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the dam for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890): *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army in a manner which shall assure that the annual Federal contribution during the project construction period does not exceed the percentage of the annual expenditure for the Oroville Dam and Reservoir which the total flood-control contribution bears to the total cost of the dam and reservoir: *And provided further*, That unless construction of the Oroville Dam and Reservoir is undertaken within 4 years from the date of enactment of this act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

"Sec. 205. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance and operation of Federal navigation, flood control or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water-supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water-supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall

share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.

"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation flood control or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further*, That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply



or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act.

"Sec. 206. (a) In order to provide adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Grapevine, Garza-Little Elm, Benbrook, Belton, and Whitney Reservoir projects in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real estate requirements of the projects the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof whenever he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided, subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No reconveyance shall be made if within 30 days after the last date that notice of the proposed reconveyance has been published by the Secretary in a local newspaper, an objection in writing is received by the former owner and the Secretary from a present record owner of land abutting a portion of the reservoir made available for reconveyance, unless within 90 days after receipt by the former owner and the Secretary of such notice of objection, the present record owner of land and the former owner involved indicate to the Secretary that agreement has been reached concerning the reconveyance.

"(2) If no agreement is reached between the present record owner of land and the former owner within 90 days after notice of objection has been filed with the former owner and the Secretary, the land made available for reconveyance in accordance with this section shall be reported to the Administrator of General Services for disposal in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377).

"(3) No lands heretofore conveyed to the United States Government by the city of Dallas in connection with the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir project shall be subject to reversion of title to private owners, but shall remain subject to the terms and conditions of the instrument or instruments of conveyance which transferred the title to the United States Government.

"(b) Any such reconveyance of any such land or interests shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as regulations prescribe to the former owner of such land or interests, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interests from such former owner in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

"(c) Any reconveyance of land therein made under this section shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest, except that no mineral rights may be reserved in said lands unless the Secretary finds that such reservation is needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir projects designated in this section.

"(d) Any land reconveyed under this section shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United

States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the reservoir projects specified in subsection (a) of this section), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

"(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

"(f) As used in this section the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land, or interests therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children, or the heirs at law; and the term "present record owner of land" shall mean the person or persons in whose name such land shall, on the date of approval of this act, be recorded on the deed records of the respective county in which such land is located.

"(g) The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this section to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

"(h) Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(i) This section shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

"Sec. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

"Streams, river basins, and areas in New York and New Jersey for flood control, major drainage, navigation, channel improvement, and land reclamation, as follows: Hackensack River, Passaic River, Raritan River, Arthur Kill, and Kill Van Kull, including the portions of these river basins in Bergen, Hudson, Essex, Middlesex, Passaic, Union, and Monmouth Counties, N. J.

"Deep Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

"Mills Creek, Fla.

"Streams in Seminole County, Fla., draining into the St. Johns River.

"Streams in Brevard County, Fla., draining Indian River and adjacent coastal areas in-

cluding Merritt Island, and the area of Turnbull Hammock in Volusia County.

"Lake Pontchartrain, La., in the interest of protecting Salt Bayou Road.

"San Felipe Creek, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Del Rio, Tex.

"El Paso, El Paso County, Tex.

"Rio Grande and tributaries, at and in the vicinity of Fort Hancock, Hudspeth County, Tex.

"Missouri River Basin, S. Dak., with reference to utilization of floodwaters stored in authorized reservoirs for purposes of municipal and industrial use and maintenance of natural lake levels.

"Stump Creek, tributary of North Fork of Mahoning Creek, at Sykesville, Pa.

"Little River and Cayuga Creek, at and in the vicinity of Cayuga Island, Niagara County, N. Y.

"Bird, Caney, and Verdigris Rivers, Okla. and Kans.

"Watersheds of the Illinois River, at and in the vicinity of Chicago, Ill., the Chicago River, Ill., the Calumet River, Ill. and Ind., and their tributaries, and any areas in northeast Illinois and northwest Indiana which drain directly into Lake Michigan with respect to flood control and major drainage problems.

"All streams flowing into Lake St. Clair and Detroit River in Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne Counties, Mich.

"Sacramento River Basin, Calif., with reference to cost allocation studies for Oroville Dam.

"Pescadero Creek, Calif.

"Soquel Creek, Calif.

"San Gregorio Creek and tributaries, California.

"Redwood Creek, San Mateo, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of South San Francisco, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of Burlingame, Calif.

"Kellogg and Marsh Creeks, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Eastkoot Creek, Stinson Beach area, Marin County, Calif.

"Rodeo Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Pinole Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Rogue River, Oreg., in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and allied purposes.

"Kihel District, Island of Maui, T. H.

"Sec. 208. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9 (a) of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 209. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood-control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for flood control and allied purposes, to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

"Sec. 210. Title II may be cited as the Flood Control Act of 1957."

Mr. MACK of Washington (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, inasmuch as the items in this amendment are the items in the bill which I introduced as a substitute and also include

the 19 projects the gentleman from Minnesota has just mentioned.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object; and, of course, I shall not, but for further clarification will the gentleman explain again, just to be certain we have it, whether he included the 19 new projects in my amendment?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Plus 112 projects in addition. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the purpose of offering my amendment is to speed up consideration of the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman says he has included 112 projects which were in the bill yesterday. Which projects were deleted? What number of projects are deleted?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are deleting or modifying only those projects that were in the minority report. These are the only ones we want to delete or modify.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman has deleted from S. 497 all projects that have been objected to in whole by the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps of Engineers; is that correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct, the 18 projects that were involved.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman's bill that he is bringing before us for consideration is what is characterized as a clean bill. It incorporates only projects that have been satisfactorily investigated and recommended by the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, except in few instances where changes have been made relative to local participation. This is the bill that goes along with the large percentage of projects of Members of the House that have been thoroughly investigated and recommended by Army Engineers.

Mr. BLATNIK. If the gentleman from Minnesota understands it correctly, the gentleman from Washington has deleted from S. 497, as amended, all projects objected to by the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers except where you have made alterations to comply with the requirements of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MACK of Washington. There are only 4 of those that are deleted; 14 are modified.

Mr. BLATNIK. May I ask whether in the additional 19 projects that were included, the 3 dealing with hurricane flood control were approved?

Mr. MACK of Washington. All 19 are included in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state that he accepts the three projects objected to by the Bureau of the Budget included in the amendment adopted by our committee last week?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We accept the 19 amendments that were adopted last week.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In other words, you accept some projects of the Bureau of the Budget and reject others?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I say we accept 19 projects that were approved by the committee last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded reading the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, since this is the most important amendment to be offered to the bill I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, most reluctantly I shall have to object. I object.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, my substitute includes all 112 projects that were discussed yesterday and which all administration bureaus and agencies are agreed are sound and desirable. In addition it includes the 19 projects that were adopted last week by the Public Works Committee. My amendment includes 131 projects. The minority does object to the 18 projects to which various administrative departments of the Government question. We object on the ground that we fear that if we adopt today a bill which contains too many projects that are objectionable to the President, the bill may meet the same fate as the one in 1956—be vetoed—with the result that we will obtain no legislation at all. I am trying to save by my proposal the 131 projects that are acceptable to the executive branch and to most of the members of the Committee on Public Works.

My amendment, which is a substitute, differs somewhat from the proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota in that it proposes to delete or to modify 18 of the projects in the bill.

We propose to modify the Port Aransas project on the LaQuinta Channel in Texas. We authorize the project. We guarantee to pay the maintenance of the project. We do not authorize the payment of \$953,000 to the local interests as a refund. This project was undertaken without any authorization by Congress. While the Army Engineers have recommended the payment of the \$953,000 to local interests the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army both oppose this refund.

We propose with reference to hyacinth flood-control projects pertaining to 8 States in the South, that the payments be made on the basis of 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by local interests.

With reference to the Mohawk flood-control projects in New York, there are 2 projects at South Amsterdam and at Herkimer involving \$2 million. My amendment authorizes these. We say that the \$240,000 project at Rome, N. Y., which did not have satisfactory benefit-cost ratio, be disallowed and that this project be not undertaken by the Army Engineers until its benefit-cost ratio is brought up to parity.

We are deleting four projects from the bill. We are deleting a project as to a school in North Dakota costing \$42,000, for replacement of a sewage plant for this school. The Army Engineers have testified they have authority now to pay the school district for the damages to its sewage plant, or the Army Engineers can replace that facility in kind, which makes it as good as it originally was. This is fair.

We object to two projects in California, the Buchanan and the Hidden Reservoirs, on the ground that under the Eisenhower administration and under the Truman administration the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army objected to these projects on the ground that satisfactory data had not been included upon which to base the cost estimates.

We object to a rivers and harbors project at Greenville, Miss., on the ground that there has been no survey made of this project by the United States Army Chief of Engineers, no survey of the project by the Bureau of the Budget, no review of it by the Rivers and Harbors Board here in Washington, and no report on the project by the Bureau of the Budget. There have been no hearings before our committee on the Greenville project, which will cost a million and a half dollars. The members of our committee do not know whether the depth of the harbor is 10, 20, or 40 feet. We do not know what type of vessels use this harbor, whether cargo vessels or fishing craft or yachts. We know nothing about the type of improvement that the Army Engineers contemplate. There has been no testimony on this project before our committee.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MACK of Washington moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, one of the principal controversies in this bill is over land enhancement. The Truman Director of the Budget in 1952, after a study that was made by five members of the Truman administration, Interior, Commerce, Agriculture Departments, the Power Commission, and United States Army Engineers, recommended that in flood projects all costs that were public, that relieve flood damage, save property from damage, save the gravel and stone from piling up on the land, the destruction of roads, evacuating people from flooded areas—all those costs are properly chargeable as public benefits. Then the Bureau of the Budget said that where there was land enhancement, where the value of the land was increased by the flood-control project, the local interests should pay one-half of the cost of the project related to land enhancement.

I can best explain that by referring to the Tombigbee project in Alabama and Mississippi. This project, according to the Army Engineers, would cost in ex-



cess of \$25 million. The Army Engineers, after a full study of land enhancement, said that 58 percent of the project would inure to the owners of the land, enhance the value of their land, so that they could sell it for higher prices. So, under this enhancement formula the Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget said that the people in Alabama and Mississippi in this flood-control district should pay one-half of the 58 percent of land enhancement or 29 percent of the cost of the project. Land enhancement was figured as a benefit. The majority objects to it being considered in relation to the cost of the project. They accept all of the proposals of the Bureau of the Budget as they relate to determining benefits of projects, but they do not accept the proposition that local interests paying any costs then enhance land values. Unless land enhancement, the windfall money that goes to the landowners, is considered as a benefit, this project would not be a worthy flood-control project. The total annual cost of the project is \$1.8 million. The annual land enhancement benefit is \$1,162,000, leaving only \$669,000 as the annual flood-control benefits. If we consider the benefits and cost purely as the basis of flood control, the annual benefits will be \$669,000 and the costs more than \$1 million a year, on that basis the project would not be sound.

Now, in the White River section in the lower Mississippi backwater, there is another land enhancement project. This is very similar to the one we have just mentioned.

There is a project in New Mexico where the Federal cost is \$2,066,000 and the land enhancement \$272,000. My amendment would require the local interests to pay the \$272,000.

On another New Mexico project the cost is more than \$3 million, and the land enhancement \$49,000, according to the Engineers. This \$49,000 should be paid for by the local interests and my amendment so provides.

There are two other projects where they do not meet with the approval of the Army Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Secretary of the Army. I am going to leave that part of the discussion to the gentleman from Florida, who has made a very special study of those projects.

The Saline River is another of the land enhancement projects that involve the same objections as the Tombigbee project.

There are two modifications of language in my amendment. One gives a State, where a dam is built, the assurance that it will receive a fair and equitable share of the power from that dam as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. This proposal will be discussed by one of the other members of the committee. Also there is section 205, a complicated section relating to water conservation and utilization which will be discussed by the gentleman from California who has devoted much time to studying this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack], has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack].

The preferential motion was rejected. Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Blatnik amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON of Oklahoma to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK of Minnesota: Page 34, line 10, after the word "Engineers" change the period to a comma and add the following: "and the third section of said act is amended by striking out after 'all claims heretofore or hereafter' the words 'asserted of whatever nature including but not limited to' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'arising from or out of the.'"

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this at the outset.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes, but this is a rather technical matter and I should like to proceed for several minutes, if I may, before yielding.

For those who are concerned about the details of this amendment, I should like to refer them to yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 3854 and 3855 in which the complete background of this particular amendment is set forth to the limit of my ability.

I might further amplify and make clear and complete the record by saying that I had sought to have for yesterday's RECORD a letter from the Attorney General on the question, but I had not received it yesterday afternoon. That letter has now been received and to make it perfectly clear, to put everything on the table with regard to this amendment, I would like to state that the Attorney General's letter dated March 10 states that the Department is opposed to the proposed amendment, and it states several reasons for that, which I am quite sure will be discussed by Members of the minority who oppose this particular amendment.

The final reasoning of the Attorney General in opposition to it is that it would seem inappropriate that an amendment be interposed which would obviously affect the conduct and the results of the litigation now pending before the Court.

This amendment was adopted by the committee by a vote of 21 to 6 to correct an apparent misinterpretation of language appearing in a 1954 act, an apparent misinterpretation by reason of very broad and general language in a waiver of claims by the Grand River Dam Authority in the State of Oklahoma under which the Federal Government, through the Attorney General at this time, is seeking to prevent a court from hearing the merits of a cause of action which this power authority is bringing against the United States on a completely different and unrelated matter from the legislation in 1954.

The language which was used in the 1954 act provided that the Grand River Dam Authority would waive all claims heretofore or hereafter asserted against the Government, asserted of whatever nature, including but not limited to the

maintenance and operation of the Markham Ferry Dam which was the subject of the 1954 legislation. The key words, and the objectionable words, are the words "but not limited to."

This language seeks to substitute—and the committee majority and some Members of the minority felt that it was only equitable and fair to do so—seeks to substitute for the language of the 1954 act the standard phraseology that is used in legislation of this type and make the waiver apply only to claims heretofore or hereafter arising from or out of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Markham Ferry Dam.

If this amendment is not adopted, it is entirely possible that the State will not be given its day in court with reference to the claim against the Government. If this language is not adopted, it will be possible that our State power authority will be precluded from ever maintaining a cause of action of any kind against the Federal Government. This power authority carries on numerous relationships with the Federal Government in connection with the supply of power and steam to military and defense installations and Federal agencies in that area.

The idea which we seek to prevent by enactment of this corrective legislation is the idea that it might be possible by loose language in a waiver of claims to prevent a State agency from ever maintaining any action of any kind against the United States Government. I do not think that was the intent back in 1954. I think the exhibits that are part of the Record for yesterday support and carry out that position.

I think the position the Attorney General takes, that it would be an interference with litigation to adopt this language, could be used in futuro and ad infinitum to prevent any kind of correction of this particular situation. We may have a number of lawsuits pending in future years against the United States Government by the power authority of the State of Oklahoma. If this language is not changed, it will remain on the books to prevent any type of action in the future. When we do file these actions in the future, all the Attorney General will have to say is, "We cannot change the language in the law, we cannot change this statutory waiver because there is litigation in progress," and there can be litigation in progress initiated by either side indefinitely in the future.

What I ask by this amendment, that the committee felt was right and proper, is a correction to this language in the 1954 act to make possible a day in court for the State of Oklahoma and the Grand River Dam Authority. I earnestly hope the committee will go along with this amendment, as did the Committee on Public Works.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the able gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. It applies to a project in his State which is of great importance to the people of his State. The clarification of intent which he requested has been explained clearly to us.

This amendment was considered by the whole House Committee on Public Works and voted and reported favorably by the committee.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Did the gentleman point out to the committee that no place in any other legislation of the same type does this particular language apply? It is the only project that has this particular language in it.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma and strenuously oppose the adoption of the amendment.

First, this amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with any project related in this bill. It is an attempt to add onto this bill an amendment which would defeat the position the United States Government has taken in a lawsuit which is currently pending against the United States by the Grand River Dam Authority of the State of Oklahoma, for \$10 million.

There were no hearings whatsoever on this amendment. We had concluded hearings on this bill when this amendment was introduced. The Army Engineers do have a vital interest in the changing of this language. The Department of Justice, which is defending the lawsuit which would be defeated if this amendment is adopted, were not given a chance to present their point of view. Now let us see just what happened in this case. The gentleman from Oklahoma said that this lawsuit involves an entirely different matter than the act which he is seeking to amend. Originally, there were three dams to be built in the State of Oklahoma, namely, the Pensacola, the Markham Ferry, and the Fort Gibson Dams. They were to be built by the Federal Government as one unit. Later, the Grand River Dam Authority was established by the State of Oklahoma and the Pensacola Dam, the one dam, was built. The Pensacola Dam was built by the State authority of Oklahoma. The Fort Gibson Dam, which is part of this trio of dams involved in this matter, was built by the Federal Government and is presently being operated by the Federal Government. The Markham Ferry Dam was started to be constructed by the Federal Government and then, as a result of the legislation that this amendment is seeking to amend, the Federal Government got out of the construction of the Markham Ferry Dam, but contributed \$6,500,000 to the construction by the State authority. The suit that is pending in the Federal court at the present time is a suit against the Federal Government arising from waters that the State of Oklahoma claims are being used illegally by the United States, which waters come from the Pensacola Dam. The Markham Ferry project lies immediately between these two dams. The reason this clause was put into the 1954 legislation, which authorized the

Federal Government to contribute \$6,500,000 to the Markham Ferry Dam, was that at that very time and prior to the passage of this legislation, the State of Oklahoma had already asserted this \$10 million claim. It had already asserted this \$10 million claim against the United States. What I am trying to say is that at the time of the passage of this act, which they seek to amend, the claim of the State of Oklahoma was pending against the Federal Government so that when the Federal Government agreed to contribute \$6,500,000 it wanted to protect itself from that very claim which has now resulted in a lawsuit. So that is the reason the waiver-of-claim language was put into that act, to relieve the United States after it paid this \$6,500,000 to the State of Oklahoma from any liability. Now, for us to say at this point in the middle of the game that we are going to change the rules and pass legislation which would automatically defeat this lawsuit for the Government of the United States, in my opinion, it would be most criminal. The Attorney General, who did not have a chance to be heard before our committee, takes that same position as I do. He sent a letter to the chairman of this committee and said in that letter substantially what I have said to you gentlemen here today. The letter is as follows:

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the informal request from your committee for the views of the Department of Justice upon a proposed amendment to S. 497, 85th Congress, 1st session, "An act authorizing public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

It is understood that your committee has proposed that the following amendment be added at the end of line 6, on page 89 of S. 497 (Union Calendar No. 428, Rept. 1122): "and the third section of said act is amended by striking out after \* \* \* all claims heretofore or hereafter \* \* \* the words \* \* \* asserted of whatever nature including but not limited to \* \* \* and inserting in lieu thereof the following: \* \* \* arising from or out of \* \* \*."

This Department is opposed to the proposed amendment for the following reason:

There is now pending in the United States Court of Claims on action entitled *Grand River Dam Authority v. The United States*, No. 226-56. In that case the Grand River Dam Authority seeks to recover \$10 million, allegedly representing just compensation claimed for the taking by the United States of water in the Grand River which the Grand River Dam Authority asserts that it owns exclusively, and for the taking of its franchise to produce power.

The United States owns and operates the Fort Gibson Dam and Reservoir project, which is about 50 miles downstream from a dam owned and operated by the Grand River Dam Authority at Pensacola. The Grand River Dam Authority has asserted that the use of waters which it owns and releases from its Pensacola Dam is an uncompensated taking and that the production of power by the Fort Gibson Dam constitutes the taking by the United States of the Grand River Dam Authority's franchise.

That suit was tried on the issue of liability at Tulsa, Okla., on January 13 and 14, 1958. At the trial the United States asserted

as one of its defenses the fact that the acceptance by the Grand River Dam Authority of \$6,500,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 3 of the act of July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), would, under the existing language of section 3 of that act, " \* \* \* constitute the agreement of the Grand River Dam Authority to hold and save the United States free and harmless from all claims heretofore or hereafter (arising from or out of) acquisition of land, relocation, construction, operation and maintenance of the dam and reservoir."

The proposed amendment of the language of section 3 is designed to eliminate the defense presented at the trial of the case in that the acceptance by the Grand River Dam Authority of the amount appropriated would no longer constitute a bar to the present action.

The suit is now before the court and the parties are engaged in preparing proposed findings of fact and briefs. After formal argument it will be before the court for decision on all of the claims and defenses which have been asserted. It would seem inappropriate that an amendment be interposed which would obviously affect the conduct of and the result of the litigation now pending before the court.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,  
Deputy Attorney General.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Edmondson amendment because I believe it consists of nothing more than a very proper attempt on the part of the Congress to clarify the matter of Congressional intent.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding to me. I take this additional time only to respond to several statements which I am afraid are a little bit inaccurate as to the exact facts regarding the history of this particular suit.

The documents which appear at page 3855 in the RECORD support a little different state of facts as to the origin of this particular controversy. They show that the Oklahoma Legislature created the Grand River Dam Authority in 1935 and specifically authorized it to build the Pensacola, Markham Ferry, and Fort Gibson projects, granting to them exclusive franchise to develop and use the waters of Grand River and its tributaries for the production of electric power and energy. At that time the United States had expressly declared no Federal interest in Grand River. The authority built Pensacola, the first unit of its comprehensive plan. Subsequently, during the war, the Federal Government came along, largely as a war measure, and took over this Pensacola Dam. Thereafter, the Pensacola Dam was turned over to the Grand River Dam Authority. We now have this situation, that the Grand River Dam Authority is maintaining an action because of the use of the water at Fort Gibson Dam and the use of the Fort Gibson Dam is completely unrelated to the construction of



the Markham Ferry Dam, which was the subject of the 1954 legislation.

I do not know the source of the gentleman's statement that this claim by the State of Oklahoma inspired this peculiar language in the 1954 act, but I do know that the document which I have placed in the Record gives evidence of the position which the State takes, that there was no knowledge whatsoever on the part of the State that any such position was being taken for the Federal Government to bar their other claims. Opponents of this amendment have not denied the facts which I have contended, that if we let this language stand it would not be possible for the State of Oklahoma to maintain any action against the Federal Government of any nature arising from any cause. What kind of a waiver is that? To come in and waive all claims against the Federal Government in order to secure Federal funds for a dam. I do not believe there is anything in the hearings which supports the fact that that was the understanding of the State of Oklahoma.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the letter from the Department of Justice substantiates just what I said to this Committee today?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The letter from the Department of Justice, if I have the same copy which the gentleman has, makes no statement whatsoever that this language was specifically put into the 1954 act to bar any claim by the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHERER. But does he not say that it will defeat the Government's position, and that he is opposed to it?

Mr. EDMONDSON. He said he is opposed to it. He believes it would be putting legislation into effect during litigation.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Was the Attorney General given an opportunity to explain before the Committee voted on your amendments any of the facets involved in this very complicated problem? The fact is, he was not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I sought to get an opinion from the Attorney General before this House in time to present it yesterday. I wrote my letter in time to receive his reply, but I had not received his reply until this noon.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing more than changing the rules of the game right in the middle of the game. There is a \$10 million lawsuit pending. The result of this would be to nullify the defense of the United States Government in that suit, which is presently pending in the Court of Claims. In that case the Department of Justice claims that Public Law 476 releases the Government from any liability in this Fort Gibson claim. Under their construction

the authority is barred from asserting any claim of any nature against the United States.

That is the defense the United States has in this suit before the Court of Claims as is admitted by the gentleman from Oklahoma in his insertions in the Record at page 3855. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary as well as the Committee on Public Works I think this is bad legislation; I think it is an extremely bad precedent to set to change the law. It is the basic law upon which the defense of the Attorney General relies in this case before the Court of Claims involving a claim against the United States in the amount of \$10 million.

In the matter of this amendment that is now proposed, and it was proposed before the Committee on Public Works, no opportunity was given for the Department of Justice to appear before the Public Works Committee to discuss this matter at all. The members of the Public Works Committee have not been advised otherwise that the effect of this will be to completely nullify the Government's defense in this particular suit.

The Department of Justice has not been given an opportunity to testify as to whether there are other defenses available to the United States.

I say that this changes the rules in the middle of the game by changing the basic legislation involved. It is extremely bad precedent particularly as there have been no hearings before our Public Works Committee on this particular issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio to complete the answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHERER. The proponents of this amendment contend that the waiver in this legislation which they now seek to amend had nothing whatsoever to do with the present claim that is being prosecuted against the Federal Government. On that very Markham Ferry bill, the bill they seek to amend, the Secretary of the Army in his testimony before the committee on that bill says this:

The Pensacola-Markham Ferry and completed Gibson Reservoirs were originally recommended by the Chief of Engineers for construction and operation by the Federal Government as one coordinated unit in the combined interest of flood control and power development—

And so forth. And he says further on that we must protect the Federal Government from all claims. Therefore, it was necessary to insert this waiver provision in the 1954 act.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Was not that "We must protect the United States Government from all claims in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Markham Ferry Dam?"

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It was intended to apply to claims arising from construction, operation, and maintenance of the Markham Ferry Dam.

Mr. SCHERER. No. Just one minute, if the gentleman please. I did not go quite far enough in my reading:

The original plan, or the original authorization, contemplated that the Pensacola, Markham Ferry, and Fort Gibson projects

would be operated in the best combined interest for flood control and power. I think it is important that we do have a measure of coordination which will preserve and protect the Government's investment in the Fort Gibson project.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman has said that this amendment would nullify totally the defense of the United States in this lawsuit, but the gentleman does not indicate that it would nullify a defense on the merits of the controversy, does he?

Mr. SCHERER. The Attorney General told me that it would.

Mr. EDMONDSON. How would the assertion of a waiver affect the merits of a suit by the State against the United States for taking over this river during World War II?

Mr. SCHERER. As I said, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma was submitted after the hearings were closed. I admit it is a highly complicated matter; I admit I do not understand all the facets of this problem, although I have discussed it with the Attorney General.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided and there were—ayes 85, noes 73.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EDMONDSON and Mr. MCGREGOR.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 144, noes 117.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mack amendment and to the veiled threat that has been expressed here on the floor of the House that we run the risk of a Presidential veto unless we knuckle under and bend our knees and bow down completely to the Bureau of the Budget, letting them in effect write the bill for us. I think I have more confidence in the President of the United States than do those Members of the House who have been expressing that veiled threat.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we have the kind of a President who, with 5 million people unemployed throughout the country, with 4 years having elapsed since the last such authorization law, with necessary work having to be stopped on several important river basins because of the reaching of the existing ceilings, with 96.4 percent of the monetary authorizations in this bill admitted by his own Bureau of the Budget to be needed, would veto this bill simply out of spite for the remaining 3.6 percent on which the Congressional committee has exercised its own judgment. I do not believe we have that kind of a President. I do not believe,

Mr. Chairman, that we have the kind of a President who would deny to the Congress of the United States the right to exercise its own mature judgment, its own enlightened conscience, and its own deliberate discretion on a meager 3.6 percent of the total financial authorizations in the bill.

If we did have such a President—and I do not concede that we have—who would demand that the legislative branch prostrate itself and let the administration branch write the law down to the last dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t," then he would be a dictator; and if we had such a President, and I do not concede that we have, it would be high time for us to come to grips with him.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Texas wants to have a President that will see that the law is obeyed; and I refer my distinguished friend to section 202 of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1954 which says that—

No project or any modification not authorized as a project for flood control or rivers and harbors shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report on such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

Is not that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I am familiar with the provision from which he is reading. I should like to point out that this provision requires only that a report be submitted by the Chief of Engineers. It does not require that it be a favorable report, nor even a written report. We have had such reports submitted, and I will say to the House that it is very significant that the Corps of Army Engineers had placed its stamp of approval on all but six-tenths of 1 percent of the financial authorizations in this bill. The language cited by the gentleman expressly does not require that the Congress first secure permission from the Budget Bureau as a requisite for Congressional action.

Mr. Chairman, let us examine this Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget was created by the Congress in 1921. It was created not to dictate but merely to advise, not to make policy—that was left to the Congress—but merely to provide statistics. And now we have the suggestion on the floor of this House that the Congress should subordinate itself to its creature.

To adopt this amendment and to say by inference that the Congress does not trust its own judgment in even a few of these matters, but must be censored by an administrative board, to say that we are incapable of exercising our own discretion in even so small a portion of this total legislation, to make the approval or disapproval of any bureau the final criterion, would be to destroy the very purpose of the legislative committees of the House. And with it, were we to surrender our prerogatives in so supine

and servile a fashion, the effect would be to destroy the very purpose of the House itself.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Public Works has not lightly considered any of these projects. Our deliberations upon all of these projects have extended over a period of 3 years. On each of them we have heard both sides in minute detail and we have felt, after careful deliberation, that there were good and valid reasons for the inclusion of every item we recommend to you. As a matter of fact, on each of these items we have heard the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and in a vast majority of instances we have acceded to its requests, adopted its recommendations and acted favorably upon them. The only thing we have not done in this regard has been to surrender completely the integrity of our own committee and to turn over to the Bureau of the Budget, lock, stock, and barrel, the power of life and death over every project and thus to make of our committee merely a rubber stamp for this administrative agency.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and a necessary bill. I know of nothing more important to the economic future of our country than the orderly development of our Nation's water resources. This bill provides badly needed authorizations to assist in that orderly development. I urge that we defeat the Mack amendment and adopt the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] has expired.

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, S. 497, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, passed the Senate on March 28, 1957.

On March 29 it was referred to the House Committee on Public Works.

On August 13, 1957, it was reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

In the first week of March 1958, almost 1 year later, it comes to us for a vote.

Now there is nothing unusual in the time sequence I have just mentioned except that much has happened, both in this country and the world during that same period, that has a bearing upon this bill.

S. 497, in the normal course of events, provides substantial authorizations for various and necessary projects, but in view of the current recession which was not anticipated last summer, it is insufficient in its scope.

Public works programs are expanded and accelerated during economic declines for the further purpose of creating jobs, increasing purchasing power, and stimulating recovery.

On February 27, 1958, the Congressional Joint Economic Committee called

for a stepped-up public works program "to brake the business recession."

The President has twice declared that the Government is preparing to accelerate existing public works programs, and there is no better place to start than the area of public works on rivers and harbors and flood control projects.

Surveys and plans that would require long and detailed preparation in the case of new and emergency projects are ready and waiting for the go-ahead from Congress. The Corps of Engineers, with the foresight for which it is noted, has accomplished the preliminary paperwork on projects for which they anticipate approval in the future. These blueprints can lead to actual construction without intervening delays, once the Congress decides on a speedup in public works as a counteroffensive against recession.

These, in addition to the highway- and postal-construction programs, can provide employment in all of the States, and reverse the economic decline before it gathers momentum.

Additional help is needed for New England flood-control projects, which were ordered stretched out last year, as were other projects throughout the Nation, during the economy wave.

I am interested in accelerating progress on the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir project in New Hampshire. This is the key to flood control of the Merrimack River which flows through New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

After 20 years of redtape and delays, the \$34 million project was finally approved, but with an initial appropriation of only \$600,000 last year.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated that, if the 1936-38 floods should sweep through the valley again this year, the damage would exceed \$74 million in New Hampshire and \$140 million in Massachusetts.

With the present heavy snow cover in the mountains, we are apprehensive.

I cite these facts to show the necessity of speeding up this project.

Similar situations exist in other parts of the country that could result in flood losses far in excess of the money required to build the necessary reservoirs and dams to protect our lives and our property.

Because of these needs, plus the opportunity to provide jobs for the unemployed, I believe that S. 497 should be expanded to authorize full-scale construction of those projects on which a start has been made, with the urgent recommendation that appropriations to implement these projects should be approved as soon as possible.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to reply to my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] a member of the committee. He is inferring that the President is asking us to waive our rights as Members of Congress. He said that he hoped that the President would give us authority to act as Members of Congress. I want to call the Committee's attention to the existing law passed by this Congress—by the House and by the other



body—and signed by the President of the United States. And it is a law. May I quote from section 202 of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1954:

No project or any modification not authorized as a project for flood control or rivers and harbors shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report on such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

Is my friend from Texas asking you or me or the President to break the law? That is the situation we are faced with today. The President is only suggesting that we act in conformity with the existing law.

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

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The language which the gentleman has quoted says unless a report has been submitted. It does not say unless they have given us their permission. It does not say it has to be a favorable report. We have received reports from the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers, most of them written, some of them verbal, on every one of these projects, and therefore it complies with the law.

Mr. McGREGOR. We have a President who does not want to interfere with the prerogatives of Congress and he wants us to do what we want to do and what we think best in conformity with the law. Last year he vetoed a similar bill. Why? Because certain projects had not been recommended by the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with the very same thing today. Are you going to take four projects that have not been okayed, and jeopardize all the rest of the good projects in this bill? I want to say firmly and honestly, if the President vetoed the bill last year because of projects that were not in conformity with the Flood Control Act, in my humble opinion he will veto this. Are you who have projects going to jeopardize those good projects, those projects that have been in compliance with the law, by accepting four projects which amount to only \$139,175,000? Are you going to jeopardize \$1,400 million by accepting these projects?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if it is not true that in connection with the Greenville project on the lower Mississippi River estimated to cost \$2,500,000 that the Chief of Army Engineers never reported it? The Secretary of the Army has made no report, and the Budget Bureau has made no report. There were no hearings held by the committee on any phases of this project.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman from Washington is correct. May I read one paragraph of the President's budget message on a similar bill:

Existing law requires that before a report of the Chief of Engineers recommending authorization of a project is submitted to

the Congress the affected States must be accorded an opportunity to comment on the proposal.

Did these States have that opportunity on these projects? Absolutely not, and the record will so show.

I repeat, please do not jeopardize over 100 good projects because of the attitude of some Members of Congress who are going to try to force down your throats projects that are not in compliance with the law, projects that are not meritorious. Please do not jeopardize good projects, for that very reason.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to a situation which has taken place and is now taking place in the House Committee on Public Works. That is the matter of the use of general proxies in this committee.

Certainly, the use of these proxy votes does not lead to the best legislative processes in the decisions of this committee, nor do the decisions necessarily represent the informed opinion of those members present at the committee sessions.

General proxy votes have been used by the House Committee on Public Works on a number of occasions when the most important issues were being considered. Four major pieces of legislation were largely decided by proxy votes in 2 days during the current session of the House. These included S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control which we are considering today, as well as the TVA bill and the expiration of the Lease Purchase Act. Now it seems that the House Committee on Public Works will either have to rescind some of the actions it took last year, or else they will face Presidential veto.

Efforts have been made to bring the matter of proxy voting up before the Committee, but so far this subject has not been permitted to be discussed.

To say the least, it is more than a little discouraging to have the vote decided ahead of time by a few pieces of paper which a chairman or acting chairman carries in his pocket on matters which affect the tax bills of all Americans. It is even more discouraging to have these same pieces of paper used almost a hundred times in one 2-day session of the House Committee on Public Works.

No such absentee voting is permitted on the floor of the House of Representatives by its Members during the regular course of Congressional business. It is only fitting that this same rule should apply to the House's designated representatives, the committees, as prevails upon the floor of the House.

The views of the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], upon the propriety of using general proxy tactics in committee is well known and is

a matter of record over a period of years of devoted and outstanding service to his Nation. In the 24 years in which the Speaker has been present at meetings of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not a single general proxy vote has been cast, because the Speaker objected to the practice.

Certainly, in committee matters where the vote of Members of Congress are more important in many ways than those cast upon the floor of the House, we should encourage in every way a full acquaintanceship of the subjects to be voted upon. We should try to discourage absenteeism from important committee sessions at every opportunity. We should discourage the practice of permitting any one man from literally carrying the votes of other Members of Congress in his pocket.

These blanket powers-of-attorney in the hands of a chairman or an acting chairman are a direct discouragement of both majority and minority members of a committee to attend sessions. The majority members know that their absenteeism can be hidden behind proxy votes, so they do not attend meetings. The minority members of a committee are aware that proxy votes are going to be used despite their full attendance, so they are discouraged from attending committee sessions.

As a protest against the use of general proxies in the House Committee on Public Works, the minority members of this committee have refrained from using a single general proxy vote. It is rather a fruitless and silent protest of a practice which makes all debate on a matter useless and beside the point.

Because of the stifling of thought, speech, acquaintanceship of the subject matter to be discussed and even attendance, I therefore urge that the use of general proxy votes be banned in House committees. Their use can only encourage steamroller tactics in these committees and are a direct detriment to orderly legislative procedures.

The House Manual states that the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of its committees. Because proxy voting is not permitted in the House, it is only fitting that general proxies should be barred in committees.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the misinformation which has been deliberately put into this debate about the situation at Greenville, Miss. The project has been reported by the Engineers. It was reported on by the representative of the Chief of Engineers to our committee. It has one of the highest benefit-cost ratios in the bill, 4.5.

The project has been reviewed and inspected by this committee as late as 3 months ago. All members of the committee were invited to inspect it. It has met every other requirement of the law, and it has been placed in this bill by the members of this committee.

I would like to point out some of this information about the law involved. Every project in this bill has been reported on by the regular process. If there were any substance to this talk

that we had violated the law in bringing out this bill, the bill would never have been brought to the floor of the House. It would be subject to a point of order and it would never have been brought to the floor of the Congress. But, we in the Congress have the power to write the law. That is what we are proposing to do here today. We are proposing to write the law.

The members of the committee are making a great to-do about the fact that they are just talking about four projects. Actually, they seek to strike out of this bill some 18 projects. They would modify and strike out six projects or four projects—it is unclear as to exactly what they mean there. But, the situation would be such that the 12 remaining projects that we are talking about would be modified in such a fashion that the sponsors of the projects, the local people involved, would rather that they not be authorized at all than for them to be authorized in such a fashion.

So, actually, do not accept this idea that there are only four projects involved because there are 18 projects involved. Once again, they are being led by the dictation of the Bureau of the Budget—dictation accepted by the minority members of our committee. I do not believe the Congress as a whole will accept that dictation. In fact, the minority members of the committee began to react a little bit about that today because today they have put into this substitute bill, which they have offered, four projects which are projects objected to by the Bureau of the Budget, which projects cost about \$37 million.

But, I think they have begun to decide that even if the Bureau of the Budget is against these projects, and even if by all standards they are bad projects, they have a lot of vote appeal—they are hurricane control projects and we ought to be doing something about hurricane control. And so you see the minority being selective in their purity. Their bill is no longer pure. As you know, you cannot be a little bit pure. You have to be either all pure or not pure. So now they are coming to you in contradiction of the only idea they had in the first place.

We should either leave out the Bureau of the Budget or else we should take the orders of the Bureau of the Budget. Now they are beginning to retreat a little bit with these amendments. So, I say to the House that what you have here is an indication of the mixed up position that you will be in if you accept the dictation of the Bureau of the Budget.

While we are discussing this, I want to call your attention to one of the projects that would be modified in such a fashion that it would be in jeopardy. I am doing this because the sponsor of the project, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAMS] cannot be with us today because of illness in his family. His project would be grossly changed by the Mack substitute. I want to call your attention to the value of the project involving the Mohawk River which is needed for the protection of Rome, N. Y. I happen to be familiar with the project. A number of people who live in Rome served with me in the Armed Forces of the United States. I certainly hope that

in the interest of some of these people that you are not going to pay lip service and pay blind allegiance to the Bureau of the Budget and knock out this project as well as a number of other worthy projects. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the gentleman from Washington who is introducing this substitute favors the Bureau of the Budget when it does not affect his district. But, just a week ago in our committee he introduced an amendment to override the Bureau of the Budget to the extent of \$1,500,000 and the committee did so.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN as an amendment to the Mack substitute: At the end of section 205 on page 48, following line 10, add the following new subsection to section 205:

"(h) The provisions of this section shall not be construed to modify the provisions of Section 1 and Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 87)."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, in the debate yesterday there were a number of questions raised as to whether the committee, by its section 205, either in the committee bill or in the Mack substitute, intended to make any modifications in section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] pointed out in the debate yesterday that we did not intend to modify those two provisions in any way. At this time I am offering an amendment to the Mack substitute to state clearly in the wording of the modified section 205 in the Mack substitute that it is not intended in that wording of section 205 to modify the provisions of section 1 or section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 in any way. Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 provides that the Corps of Engineers in drawing up plans must consult with the States in connection with those plans. Section 8 provides that if there are reclamation aspects in a Corps of Engineers project, the reclamation portions will be constructed by the Department of the Interior, and that they should construct those sections under the provisions of the reclamation laws. That will answer the questions raised by several Members yesterday and confirm that the reclamation laws would continue in effect for such portions of the projects.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am in accord with the language of the amendment, which should be accepted, because it is the clear intention of both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama to clarify the situation where there would be no misunderstanding, that any part of section 205 would trespass upon the laws of the various States of the Union.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are willing to accept the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the Mack substitute under section 202 it says:

Section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944—

That is the Flood Control Act. Would you have any objection to amending your amendment to include section 8 as well as section 1?

Mr. BALDWIN. My amendment to section 205 is intended to accomplish that objective.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But you put in as an additional part section 205. In section 202 they say that the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act. If you would include section 8—that is the section which deals with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you be willing to say that the provisions of section 1 and section 8 of the act of December 22, 1944, shall govern with respect to projects authorized by this act?

Mr. BALDWIN. My amendment as submitted now would be an additional subsection to section 205 and it would not prejudice the gentleman's point of view.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Section 205 does not modify either section 1 or section 8 of the Flood Control Act and was never intended to. The amendment proposed by the gentleman will not affect it at all.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out at this time, that although I think the language is most certainly intended to protect the water rights in the Western States, I doubt that it actually does it. This is a subject which has been before the Congress of the United States ever since 1852 when for the first time the Congress of the United States said that water in the arid States of the West, those States west of the 98th meridian, was to be appropriated and used under the laws of the States and the territories of the West.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There are included in this bill projects authorizing the Corps of Engineers to construct navigation and flood-control projects. Is the gentleman from Idaho fearful that by the construction of those flood-control projects by the Corps of Engineers they will usurp the States' water laws in the administration of the project once it is completed?



Mr. BUDGE. In reply to the gentleman from Alabama, the only thing that I seek is that the law be kept in status quo, no matter what the law is now, with reference to water rights in the West. I am hopeful that the committee will accept language which will leave the law in exactly the same form in which we now find it.

If the gentleman will permit me to continue for just a moment, the same situation arose during the House consideration of the tidelands legislation. The committee at that time handling the tidelands bill accepted a very short sentence to the effect that nothing in the chapter was intended to change the laws in the Western States as regards water rights. I would appreciate very much if the gentleman from Alabama and Members on the other side would agree to accept a simple statement containing just exactly the same language as was put in the tidelands bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe that if the gentleman will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from California he will have assurances in that regard, because it accomplishes the very purpose the gentleman from Idaho seeks.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. The purpose of the amendment which I have offered is to reiterate that the existing laws as stated in the Flood Control Act of 1944, section 8, shall be retained, that is, that any reclamation project shall be constructed under the provisions of the reclamation laws; and the gentleman knows what those provisions are. They state that this reclamation work must be constructed in accordance with State laws and in accordance with interstate compacts.

Mr. BUDGE. I hope the language does what the gentleman from California thinks it does. This matter has been rather hurriedly presented, and in different language than the gentleman previously indicated to me it was to be presented, but if on examination he now finds any doubts I hope he will agree to accept a simple declaration to take care of it, and that could be done by including in this bill the language of the tidelands legislation. That will preserve the status of the law. I think it is a matter that should be taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, both the Mack bill and the bill reported by the committee do violence to State water laws historically recognized by the Congress of the United States. It, therefore, becomes necessary and proper, if we expect to carry out in a proper manner this legislation that has been the law for more than 50 years. We must amend each of these bills to insure that the water rights of the States are not destroyed.

Without proper amendments in this bill you are going to develop two water systems, one administered by the States and one administered by the Federal Government.

We cannot live under a dual administration. May I point out that historically when the original Reclamation Act was adopted in 1902 there was provision that the Secretary of the Interior was compelled to comply with the State water laws. That has been lived up to ever since.

When the original Flood Control Act was passed in 1944, in section 1 and again in section 8 there was provided a plan whereby it became necessary before you could get a project approved to submit it to the Army Engineers and meet with their approval and with the plan they had. If it turned out that it was a reclamation project, then it went to the Bureau of Reclamation and they constructed it under the laws of the Bureau of Reclamation which compelled them to recognize State water laws.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sympathetic with the desire of the gentleman, namely, that the laws regarding reclamation projects are not changed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On the other hand, I do not see the basis for his statement that section 205 today involves a fundamental change out there in regard to reclamation projects.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will answer that in this way: Under section 202 you start out and say that the provisions of section 1, the part that deals with reclamation under Public Law 534, which is the Flood Control Act of 1944, is section 8 which directs the Secretary of the Interior. If you do not have sections 1 and 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 definitely spelled out in both of these then you are doing violence to the present situation.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman makes a point in connection with sections 1 and 8 of the 1944 act. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California which establishes the very thing he seeks?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am willing to go along with the gentleman from California. But I think that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has a clearer amendment which spells it out in detail so that he who can read can understand in the future that so far as we in the West are concerned our water rights are amply protected. I have a little fear that unless that is done the references to sections 1 and 8 may not be sufficient in interpretation in the future.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to advise my colleague that I find myself in the situation where I cannot offer an amendment. My amendment would not be in order at the present time because of the fact it would not be proper under the Rules of Procedure of the House.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. May I say that the purpose of my amendment, which is now pending, is to strengthen the points discussed yesterday to be sure sections 1 and 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 are clearly recognized as continuing in effect. The purpose of it is simply to clarify and reiterate that point, which was the intention of every member of the committee that brought this bill before the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Again, as I asked the gentleman when he was speaking, under section 202 of the substitute or the Mack bill, you start out with the provision of section 1 of the act, but you do not say anything about section 8. You do wind up in the end, however, by saying, as your amendment says, it shall be in compliance, that it shall not vary from sections 1 and 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. My suggestion is that you put it at the beginning of section 202, after section 1, because it is good.

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

Mr. Chairman, Lone Rock and Gilbert Dams, which are in the committee bill, were approved by the Corps of Engineers for the addition of power to Lone Rock and for flood control and power for Gilbert in a letter transmitted May 6, 1952, by Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpening, then Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, along with a letter of the same date from Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, then Chief of Engineers, and a letter dated April 21, 1952, from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Corps of Engineers, without objection of the Bureau of the Budget.

In other words, they were found feasible and were recommended not only by the Chief of Engineers, General Pick, but by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and they were not objected to by the Bureau of the Budget.

They have a benefit-cost ratio as high as that of most other projects on the White River that are under construction. But in 1952 we did not have a rivers and harbors authorization bill because they come up only every 2 or 4 years. Where these two projects are caught is that before the next rivers and harbors bill came up in the Congress, formula A-47 was issued by the Bureau of the Budget telling the Corps of Engineers to change completely the formula which they had used previously, and this new formula made every project on the White River incapable of measuring up if it had been completely and closely followed.

All Arkansas knows of the great benefit that has accrued to the sections where the projects have been constructed in jobs, industrialization, tourist trade, and increases in population. It is just really not the same country—it has been changed. Lone Rock and Gilbert measure up to most of the previous projects on the White River so far as the benefit-cost ratio is concerned. It would be denying them the sanctuary of the family circle to exclude them from the bill.

Not only that, these projects pay for themselves. They return to the Government of the United States the money invested in them. They are good investments.

In my opinion, one of the great problems to face America in the next 25 years will be the shortage of water, not only in the now arid West but in all sections of the country, because of the increase in population, increase in industrialization, the denuding of the forests, and evaporation. I was amazed to hear the engineers testify that the water level today is at least 25 feet lower on the average than it was 25 years ago. If that continues during the next 25 years, then we will have a great shortage of water.

I am asking you, the Members of this House, to reject this amendment and to include these worthwhile projects in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to associate myself with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] in protecting our States water rights, because these water rights are our life blood.

#### STATE WATER LAWS AND FEDERAL USURPATION

The retention by the States of their historic water rights against Federal encroachment is the issue upon which I rise to speak. Legislatively the issue is spelled out in the proposed Aspinall and Baldwin amendments to S. 497. This seeks to fortify the States against the devouring federalism that is now attacking what in the western half of this continent is perhaps our most precious resource. The dread peril that confronts us is that the monumental principle involved in this legislation and its relevance to the heart of American government will be lost in a morass of legalistic minutiae. Now it happens that I am not a lawyer but I cannot permit myself to be brushed off as a layman by those who are lawyers. And I will not permit a fundamental precept in a form of government all of us hold precious to be overwhelmed and buried by the growing avalanche of Federal aggression against the States.

It is impossible for me to accept the argument that greater centralization of Government is some kind of inevitable, historic force, inherent in the growth of the country and consonant with the trend of communication and the shrinkage of time and space. This position makes the wholly unsupportable presumption that the several States have been living in a state of total economic paralysis and that only this amorphous and remote power structure called the Federal Government has been enjoying growth and expansion.

Substantively the reverse is true.

It is the States that constitute the reservoir of America's economic wealth. It is the States that have been growing prodigiously and dynamically in every facet of this most advanced civilization. On the other hand the Federal power has risen artificially, mushrooming up

through the overlordship of a mass of superimposed and very obnoxious restrictive Federal legislation. The acuteness of the national peril this represents is accentuated by judicial attrition against the States from the Supreme Court. This is manifest in the notorious Pelton case known more exactly as Federal Power Commission against Oregon et al. decided June 6, 1955.

What is the Pelton case?

I learn from volume 349, United States Reports, page 435, that the Federal Power Commission issued to a power company a license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydroelectric plant, constituting Pelton project, No. 2030, on reserved lands of the United States on the Deschutes River in Oregon. The State of Oregon challenged the authority of the Commission to issue the license and the adequacy of provisions approved by the Commission for the conservation of anadromous fish. The Supreme Court rendered the extraordinary decision that the Federal Power Act is applicable in accordance with its terms, and the Federal Power Commission acted within its powers and its discretion in granting the license. Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, who happens to come from the West and must be presumed to know some of its problems at firsthand, dissented.

Now here where the vital data contains such anomalous words as "anadromous fish" we have what I mean in speaking of losing the monumental significance of the issue in a morass of detail and jargon. The water rights of the States, as an issue in Federal-State relationships, can very well have its back broken on the Supreme Court's pro-Government decision in this Pelton case. What the Court in effect decided was that so far as the issue in this case was concerned—State water rights—Oregon ceased to exist as a State. But Mr. Justice Douglas held that the United States—as I read his decision—could not build the proposed dam on this non-navigable river without in the first instance obtaining the water rights to do so in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon. It was necessary first that Oregon's water-rights law be satisfied. The dissenting Justice held that the Federal licensee who was to build the dam was given his right to do so by the United States and the United States, said Mr. Justice Douglas, I quote, "cannot give what it does not have."

There stated simply is the issue in the case.

But the overall problem is a much greater one. This decision and some of the proposed legislation—without the Aspinall or Baldwin amendment—is part of a slow, irresistibly moving process of corrosion that is grinding down, law by law and decision by decision, whatever sovereignty yet remains to the States. This issue is so vital, I hold, to the existence of the States as States that I foresee—should these amendments fail—a rising wall of indignation so charged with a righteous sense of justice, that there will be an imperative demand for a reevaluation of all the Federal-State legal and power relationships that now ensnarl the two conflicting avenues of

government. When the Federal power reaches the proportions encompassed in this decision, and legislation of otherwise sound Federal significance is passed without safeguards for the rights of the States as recommended in this amendment, then the sweep of angered reaction could compel changes more radical than anything now under contemplation. As a westerner I am offering this judgment not as a threat, but as a warning that such a threat is indeed inherent in the situation. It will explode unless measures like these amendments are this time and more and more in the future, imbedded in the legislation diagramming the areas of power and rights between the Federal Government and the States.

The Congress, beginning now, by validating once more, bluntly and decisively, the integrity of the water laws of the States, will have restored some of the damage done in the Pelton case and will forestall, perhaps obviate, this impending conflict taking a regional form, between the States and the Federal power. To me as a westerner, an educator, and a Member of the Congress, the Supreme Court's decision in the Pelton case sounds like a semi-intellectual, dream-world application, in ivory tower abstraction, of a very earthy, powerfully held, State and grassroots prerogative. The Justices who rendered this decision are, I notice, some of them from the West. But the flavor of their judgment shows not so much a geographical bias, one way or the other, as a lack of understanding produced by excessive devotion to theory and remoteness from the history and the water rights facts of life.

Of course there are the acknowledged rights of the Federal Government over navigation. Of course there is the role of the Government federally in flood control and her history in canal navigation and in opening the continent to settlement. But the State governments have been dominant at various periods in the improvement of navigation. History and tradition emphasizes their water rights. Had I the time I could develop the function the States adopted in the 19th century for making their waterways more navigable. I could detail the magnificent work they did later on in flood control on the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers where, indeed, they—the States—took the initiative. I should like to have it understood that I speak from tradition. I speak from history. I speak from a position of justice and the law and I speak with a profound regard for the future.

I know it will not be lost upon the architects of this legislation and upon the Congress contemplating the Aspinall and Baldwin amendments that what is here involved is something close to the heartblood of 17 Western States. This is 60 percent of the area of continental United States. In fact water rights in this arid or semiarid area of 1,830,000 square miles can be said to have existed long before the United States came into being. The desperate need for water in a region so limitedly favored with it, explains much of the depth of feeling that Federal usurpation can arouse. For these States water rights, sunk deep in the western consciousness, are matters



of survival, of life and death, of justice, to be fought for to the very last.

There was in the West, especially after the gold rush in the 19th century, local rules and regulations for peace and order. The State and the Territorial legislatures and courts gave these rules and regulations validity and custom even before the Federal Government added her recognition. It has been provided in these western regions that water, because of the desperate need for it, can be denied because of nonuse and granted only for beneficial use. All that this adds up to is the brutal truth that in the regions where I come from we equate water with life.

It would be dangerous, I hold, to tamper lightly with the rights that a State feels it has in its water.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to page 92 of the pending bill, S. 497, which states:

The project for flood protection on the Saginaw River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 346, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,085,000.

This project is listed on page 36 of the report of the House Committee on Public Works of August 13, 1957.

I would like to point out that the Bureau of the Budget had some initial reservations regarding this project although these were later withdrawn. They had no bearing on the 1956 veto of H. R. 12080 as witnessed by the following letter from Mr. Robert E. Merriam of the Bureau of the Budget, dated August 17, 1956 and which states in part:

I am happy to advise you that the Saginaw River project does not contain major features which are considered objectionable by the Bureau of the Budget, and that it is not included among the 32 projects specifically mentioned in the President's memorandum of disapproval on H. R. 12080.

This project would meet with the complete approval of the Bureau of the Budget if the following language were to be used in its authorization:

That the project for flood control and wildlife conservation in the Saginaw River Basin, Mich., is hereby authorized in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 346, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,107,720; of which \$2,589,600 is the Federal share of the costs allocated to wildlife conservation.

In a letter dated August 30, 1956, however, General Itschner revised these figures in accord with January 1956 price levels, to read \$16,889,000 and \$3,100,000,

respectively. This is \$804,000 above the authorization contained in S. 497.

On January 3, 1957, I introduced H. R. 566 which contained the up-to-date figures and also employed the exact wording desired by the Bureau of the Budget. I called this matter to the attention of the chairman of the Public Works Committee who notified me on January 16 that he was in turn calling it to the attention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. That was the last word I had had from the committee on the subject until early this week. However, I am now informed that the Bureau of the Budget no longer insists on its language regarding a specific allocation for wildlife conservation since that has been covered in the report of the Army Engineers. I am also informed that the Federal cost figure of \$16,085,000 as contained in S. 497 is based on the latest testimony of the Engineers. This being the case, Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the Saginaw River project as contained in S. 497 and urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the form of the bill before us troubles me deeply. Sound and approved projects are mingled with projects which have no sound reason for being there. It should be altered by an amendment to eliminate projects which are not in line with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. That is exactly what the Mack substitute does, as I understand it.

At a time when we are locked in a life-and-death struggle for our very survival, a battle which costs staggering sums of money, we can ill afford to spend the dollars of the American taxpayer on projects which are not clearly justified.

We must ever remember that it is a prime belief of the Communists that we can be forced to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. We must ever remember that our national defenses can be no stronger than the economy which backs them up.

At a time when such vast amounts must be spent to keep our guard up to deter potential military dangers, it behooves us to scan with extra-special care all nondefense items coming before us.

This bill, above all others, deserves such scrutiny. I recognize, of course, that river and harbor, beach erosion and flood-control projects are important. Realistically planned and soundly financed, they develop the sinews of our national strength. But the bill before us represents a perversion of this ideal.

Clearly, most of the projects which would be authorized by this bill are good and are needed. Unfortunately, they have been mixed up in a big package with other projects which have no good reason for being here. As a result, we are presented with a choice: Either approve a number of unjustified projects to get the good ones through, or kill the whole lot, including the many sound ones.

The only realistic answer is to amend this bill to include only those authorized according to the procedures established by Congress.

Congress has set up sound means for obtaining informed advice on complex matters such as the one before us today. Both the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers are required to pass on river and harbor, beach erosion, and flood control projects. Their careful study and objective reports are essential to proper Congressional action. If we disregard their advice, we are sabotaging the very procedures we have established not only to protect us from taking unjustified steps, but in the end to protect the pocketbooks of every American citizen.

I am extremely disturbed that a majority of the committee has chosen to ignore this expert advice. Over \$300 million worth of projects which would be authorized by this legislation have not been approved by the proper agencies of the Government.

This means that \$1 out of every \$5 which would be spent, were the bill enacted in its present form, would be doled out without technical or fiscal justification. If a pickpocket lifted a dollar from your pocket when you had only \$5 with you, it would hurt. The American taxpayer has just as much right to cry out at a similar action by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, every sound and approved project in this bill, four out of five, is imperiled if we pass the measure in its present form. One in which I have a particular interest is the project for various alterations and improvements of Irondequoit Bay, N. Y. It has the full approval of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers. Local interests have expressed a willingness and ability to carry out their end of the financial burden.

Completion of the proposed Irondequoit Bay project would bring to fruition a dream nearly a hundred years old. It would culminate the efforts of many dedicated citizens in my home city of Rochester, N. Y., who have worked unceasingly to bring about these improvements. It would provide important navigational, safety, and recreational benefits for thousands who are now denied full use of this body of water.

Because it has the backing of the requisite authorities, because it will confer great benefits on a large number of deserving people, and because it can only become a reality through Federal cooperation with local citizens, it deserves support. I hope it will survive the ordeal of this present mixed-up measure.

But, Mr. Chairman, the people of this country pay high taxes. In most cases they pay them willingly with the understanding that we will apportion this revenue intelligently for essential activities. We have a responsibility to live up to that trust which has been placed in us.

We would be abdicating that responsibility if we approved, without a fight, the bill as it has been presented to us.

If we pass the bill in its present form, I fear the President will again be forced to veto it. And he will be justified in doing so, since he, also, has a solemn

responsibility to look out for the interests of the American taxpayer.

There is altogether too much fat in the measure before us. A good, clean surgical job is called for to remove this excess. Only in that way can we insure Executive approval.

The amendment to limit the scope of this bill solely to fully authorized projects provides the scalpel by which the necessary surgery can be performed. I support it unhesitatingly and completely.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for wasteful frivolity. Every dollar we spend should be for good, sound reasons. They should be reasons dictated by the need for a strong, vigorous nation. If we are to spend money for items urgently needed to meet the threat of international communism, we must cast a highly critical eye on unnecessary frills such as are contained in S. 497.

For these reasons, the substitute for this measure, which will include only approved projects, deserves wide support. Let us stop logrolling and start using logic.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman of this subcommittee handling the bill. As I understand it, Bridgeport Harbor of Bridgeport, Conn., is in this bill; that the Federal participation is \$2,300,000, and that the non-Federal participation is \$530,000, making a total of \$2,830,000; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. Is it also true that this is an Army Engineers recommended project and a budgeted project recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BLATNIK. It is a clear project recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to compliment the committee for including this project in the bill, because there is ample justification for this project and the general benefits that will accrue to the area more than justify the Federal expenditure.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to the gentleman that the project he refers to is in the substitute bill offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], because the project has been O. K.'d by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with law.

Mr. MORANO. I want to ask this question: As I understand, there is pending before this Committee of the Whole a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Whether my amendment passes or the gentleman's amendment passes, the project will be protected.

Mr. MORANO. I want to ask whether or not your formula excludes any un-recommended or unbudgeted project in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. MACK of Washington. There is no project in New England excluded in my substitute.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

I simply wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that authorization of the Bridgeport Harbor project is long overdue; that it has been and is an Army engineers-approved project; that it was in a bill once before approved by the Congress and vetoed by the President; that it is still justified; that it has been approved by the Budget Bureau; that it is sorely needed by industries and the people of the Bridgeport and Connecticut area, and that the Congress should pass the authorization so that we can look forward to an appropriation to begin work on the harbor project. Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$530,000 as the non-Federal contribution clearly shows how vital the people of Bridgeport and Connecticut believe this project to be.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: Page 11, lines 3 to 5, after "which", strike out "50 percentum, presently estimated at \$675,000, shall be borne by the United States and 50 percentum, presently estimated at \$675,000" and insert "75 percentum, presently estimated at \$1,012,500, shall be borne by the United States and 25 percentum, presently estimated at \$337,500."

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a dispute between the Army Engineers and the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau recommending 50-50 cost sharing with the local areas, and the Army Engineers recommended that the project be paid 75 percent by the Federal Government and 25 percent by the local interests. On this side of the aisle we are willing to accept the amendment, which brings it in conformity with the Army recommendation and that of the position of the majority, and removes from the bill, from the list, one of the amendments in controversy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the objective of this, as the gentleman from Washington has said, is simply to change the local participation and the Federal contribution on the water-hyacinth program, which affects a number of the Southern States, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

The Army Engineers in its report to the committee and in its discussion of the reason for its recommended 75-25 basis, 75 Federal and 25 State participation in this program, made in my opinion a much sounder presentation than was made by the opposition, the Bureau of the Budget.

This is an entirely new program to which A-47 does not apply and to which agreements on all other projects in controversy do not apply, thus the minority is being perfectly consistent in this instance in accepting the recommendation of the Army Engineers. It contains a provision for participation of 75 percent by the Federal Government, whereas the Mack bill contains a provision for 50-50. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he will accept this amendment?

Mr. BLATNIK. Most of the legislation is 75-25. I should like to speak on that at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I should like to point out that I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that he and all except one or two other members of the minority voted against that same proposition in committee?

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that the minority had an opportunity of considering this matter along with the hurricane projects, also a new program, very carefully and of going into the justification of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Engineers as it relates to water hyacinths with regard to their recommendation of 50-50 and 25-75 and we decided that because these were new programs not under A-47 we would go along with them on a trial basis. The hurricane matter didn't come up until last week after the vote on the initial bill was taken. I call the attention of the House to pages 336 and 337 of the committee hearings, at which place the Army Engineers indicate the reason for their justification, and show that in making their study they took into consideration the economics of the future and the various benefits, the benefits to navigation, to fish and wildlife, to recreation, and other things. They made a study of the traditional local participation on each of these units. On recreation, for example, I believe they took 50-50. On navigation they used 100 percent, which is the present Federal participation, and I think that is the correct participation.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Did the gentleman say "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. CRAMER. I am answering the gentleman, if he will give me permission to do so.

Navigation, 100 percent. Then they applied those percentages to the amounts of each, in effect, weighing the percentages. After completing that computation, the overall weighted average came out to be 75 percent.

I believe this water hyacinth program is a good program. I believe the 75-25 justification as applied by the Army Engineers is a sounder one than that prepared by the Bureau of the Budget. There is involved in this \$47 million annual losses on the part of the States involved. Navigation is involved, fish, and wildlife is involved, drainage is involved, and so forth. I believe the amendment is a good one and outside the reason for



other objections by the minority and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, here is a demonstration of the confusion and lack of order, and it is understandable, that results on a complex bill being handled in this involved parliamentary manner. This bill, with 130 some projects with a total of \$1½ billion involved in authorization, in which over 96 percent of the monetary value of the projects has the approval of both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. So our controversy is limited to a small little band that has projects in which in whole or in part are in dispute. These required close scrutiny following testimony and statements by the sponsors of these projects and the local interests involved, following which the committee itself made the determination that the rigid criteria of the Bureau of the Budget should not hold, and that equitable concessions were justified. Now the minority who have been the ones to object to any projects that have not been fully approved by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, come this afternoon, in these closing hours of consideration of this bill, and they themselves include in the Mack substitute 3 projects with an authorization of over \$37,800,000, the 3 hurricane flood-control projects, which were not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Obviously they, too, feel that in some circumstances the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations should not prevail.

Now they concede further, in yielding from their position on the water hyacinth project. The majority of the committee felt that the Bureau of the Budget requirement that local participation shall be 50 percent to 50 percent Federal participation was too heavy a burden, and that because of the navigation aspects of the project that a 25 percent local and 75 percent Federal participation was more in keeping with equity and in accordance with reality. Now, again, the minority comes and they yield on their earlier premise that rigid adherence to the Bureau's recommendation must prevail.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Of course, the Federal participation over a 5-year period would only amount to slightly over a million dollars. The gentleman recalls that. But I would like to read, if I can, the minority report signed also by the gentleman from Florida who just spoke:

Since the benefits are primarily to agriculture, and the beneficiaries can be readily identified, the minority agrees with the Bureau of the Budget that a more equitable cost-sharing arrangement would be 50-percent Federal and 50-percent local. This would have no effect on the program already underway for keeping navigable waterways clear of water-hyacinths for purposes of navigation, which is done primarily at Federal expense.

Reduction of the Federal share is particularly important when we recognize that this authorization may be used as a precedent in the establishment of additional programs

for control of waterchestnuts and other noxious water plants in other areas in the future. Accordingly the minority objects to the authorization contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, that this is further evidence that they have a very fine selectivity on the other side of the aisle when they insist that they should follow the Bureau of the Budget in one case, the Army Engineers in another case—but in all cases they are, and I say this with great respect, following the dictates of their own particular conscience in these matters.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to ask whether the project embraced in the present amendment is contained in the bill as reported by the committee. If we vote down the substitute bill and vote up the committee bill we will give the gentleman exactly what he is trying to get?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. In behalf of orderly procedure, let us terminate this confusion, vote down the substitute and then alter or modify and approve the original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am against the Mack substitute and in favor of the committee bill, S. 497. I wish to amplify briefly.

Under title II, section 203, lower Mississippi River, paragraph (b) authorizes modification and extension of the plan of improvement in the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon Basin, Ark., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$1,212,000.

The extension contemplates the enlargement and/or cleanup of 7 tributaries of Boeuf River and Bayou Macon, which have drainage areas ranging between 17 and 78 square miles each, and which are obviously too large to be classed as local improvements. Local cooperation is required, as is furnished in the existing project in the basin, as also construction of supplementary farm-drainage improvements, at very substantial cost to the landowners.

While each of these seven tributary streams need the improvement, and each is well justified, and, as pointed out by the Engineers, we might have well included in the authorization bill enacted in 1946 which extended the project into Arkansas, there is a very special need for the work contemplated on Black Pond Slough to provide adequate outlet for both local drainage and for the disposal of storm and sanitary sewerage from the city of McGehee, Desha County, Ark., where from time to time the sanitary conditions have been serious due to a lack of outlet for impounded waters.

The Bureau of the Budget's objection to the proposed extension is that—

For similar projects outside of the lower Mississippi River Valley it is accepted policy to require that local interests, in addition to complying with the normal requirements of local cooperation \* \* \* also contribute in

cash or equivalent work 50 percent of the cost of the project allocated to land enhancement.

When Congress, in 1950, in the Flood Control Act of that year, authorized a limitation of local cooperation on this project to an agreement to maintain the works, it did so because of their substantial expenditures over the years for flood-control works prior to the adoption of the Federal project. The Engineers estimated that local interests had expended about \$25 million for flood control and drainage improvements in the entire area. In the immediate area covered by Chicot, Lincoln and Desha Counties local interests have spent, according to the engineers, about \$5,500,000.

Local levee and drainage districts in both Arkansas and Louisiana have furnished assurances of the local cooperation required under the law, and the engineers report that adequate maintenance is now being furnished on the work thus far completed.

The improvements contemplated in the extension will, of course, provide only main outlet channels, and must necessarily be accompanied by lateral and on-farm drainage at very substantial costs to the local interests. On that score, against a Federal cost of \$1,212,000 for the extension of these main outlet channels, there must be a local interest expenditure of \$826,000.

If the extension of this project, approved by the Engineers, the Senate, and the House Committee on Public Works is rejected, we are thereby permitting the Bureau of the Budget, in effect, to repeal a law.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am acquainted with the water-hyacinth program. When the situation of the water-hyacinth first arose, it started in my home State of Louisiana. The water-hyacinth is an imported flower, being brought here before the turn of the century as a beautiful flower. Many people thought it might give more pleasure to the art of living in our country as a result of being imported here.

In the first years after it was imported, the fact that a new plant was being brought into this land was largely ignored by our people. It was allowed to propagate and began to fill the bayous and streams in South Louisiana. So prolific was the growth and development of this plant that, in due course, it began to choke the bayous of Louisiana, killing the fish and making navigation impossible. Special boats with sharp prows plied the bayous, moving up and down, cutting these water-hyacinths to pieces with a sharp knife and maintaining to a limited extent an open channel for navigation.

This method of keeping water channels open was found to be inefficient and, in due course, other methods were devised. In spite of all our efforts to date, the water-hyacinth has become more and more prolific, spreading to more and more streams, stepping across State boundaries, to choke the rivers, creeks, and bayous throughout the country, smothering wildlife in the water and making the streams unusable. I have heard the criticism made that this is a local program, related to agriculture and therefore a 50-50 State-Federal contribution was in order. Of course, such an objection is untenable. I have never heard it said that the water-hyacinths helped agriculture; but I know that it is an outstanding menace to navigation because of its effect in making impossible navigation over inland waterways. I think it entirely proper that the United States accept the policy of making a contribution on a 75-25 percent basis.

I am interested in this entire program. In recent years our program of water utilization has been slowed up. The extravagant needs of our foreign policy and the demands upon our Government for tax funds has had the effect of threatening to strangle our inland waterways program. Even flood control, so vital to the health, happiness, and welfare of our people, is suffering badly as a result of this situation.

As president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, we will hold an important convention at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, May 14-16. At this convention will be gathered supporters of the water development program from all over the country. We intend to demonstrate that the water development program is not a matter of mere sectional interest. This convention will show that there is broad popular support and demand for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and waterways. The delegates to this convention will undoubtedly be critical of the expenditure of Federal funds on foreign projects while our own projects are being denied money. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has become increasingly critical of outlays of American tax dollars for projects which are hastily devised and which are designed to benefit the economy of so-called allies whose loyalty to our cause is doubtful in the first place.

At this convention will be shown an exhibit of Russian pork barrel projects. The Army Engineers and our military intelligence tell us that Russia has been carrying on a stupendous program of development of its internal waterways. Russia is developing 19 new ports and is electrifying navigation on its extensive inland waterway system. Russia has already launched an atomic-powered icebreaker. These facts should give us pause. They lead to the inevitable conclusion—

First. If the Russians can build dams and waterways while launching sputniks and missiles all at one and the same time, we can do the very same thing. As a matter of fact, we cannot afford to do less.

Second. It should also be kept firmly in mind that the reason for our failure

to get our Vanguard off the ground cannot be attributed in the slightest degree to the fact that we are conducting an orderly program for controlling and developing our water resources.

As conscious as we must be of budgets and appropriations, surely the Government of the United States is not so tightwad that it cannot take care of some of these crying needs.

For this reason I support an all-out effort to give this country the needed waterways and reclamation program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Blatnik amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: page 49, following line 20, strike out lines 21 to 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not be construed to modify the provisions of section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (58 Stat. 887)."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the date of the Flood Control Act in the amendment to read 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, is this similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is an identical amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to impose upon the time of the Committee to make an explanation of the amendment. It is identical to the amendment that has just been adopted by the Committee, offered by the gentleman from California, to the Mack substitute. This goes to the Blatnik amendment. I hope this will resolve any doubt of the intention of the committee to preserve the water rights in the reclamation States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. If favorable action is had upon this amendment, does that preclude offering further amendments to section 405 of the Blatnik amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington. Subsection 1, section 205 of the Mack substitute: "Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as affecting or in-

tended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which are wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say I hope I am not involved in this dispute about the Bureau of the Budget. I should not be, because last week I introduced a bill which would abolish the Bureau of the Budget, and I think it should be passed.

I very much appreciate the efforts of the members of the committee in attempting to work out this question of water rights. It is of extreme importance to us in the West.

The only thing the amendment I have offered does is to restate exactly the same law which is in the present Tidelands Act. It simply states that nothing in this bill shall be construed to change the present system of obtaining and holding water rights in the States west of the 98th meridian. I am hopeful that the Committee will adopt it. I do not see any objection to it; it simply supplements the efforts that have previously been made by members of the committee and removes doubts which some of us may have.

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

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would the effect of this language be to apply this principle of law as set forth in the act to the operations of the Army Engineers as well as to the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. BUDGE. I do not believe it would be. It is not so intended. The Corps of Army Engineers does not appropriate water for consumptive use, but the Bureau of Reclamation does.

The amendment is intended simply to restate the existing law. There is no intention to broaden the scope of existing law. We simply want to keep it in status quo; just as the law is now, we want it to be the same law tomorrow.

There is no intent to change existing law one whit.

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

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. In reading the provisions of the bill I find it does provide for storage of municipal water and other uses not before contemplated. I certainly think we are entitled to have our original water laws protected. I was in hopes the members of the committee would accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think it is a wise one and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentlemen from Wyoming and Arizona for their contributions and I know of their inter-



est in the preservation of the water rights of the West.

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the pending bill contains authorization for an additional reservoir in the Mahoning River watershed.

Although this project is not in my Congressional District, it can have a beneficial effect for many of my constituents.

One of the existing projects on the Mahoning River is the Berlin Reservoir a few miles north of Alliance, Ohio. When this reservoir was created local citizens were encouraged to regard it as a new recreational opportunity. Considerable investment has been made in summer homes, docks, and equipment.

We have been seriously disappointed to find that the operation of this reservoir for the purpose of controlling downstream flow is not always compatible with recreational uses and in most years the water level is lowered in late summer so that there can be no recreational use. Instead of a lake we have acres of mud flats and dying fish.

For the past several years I have been trying to find a solution to this problem. I hope that construction of the new reservoir on the West Branch may be the solution, and that the operation of this additional reservoir can be coordinated with Berlin and Mosquito Creek so that it will no longer be necessary to lower Berlin excessively during August and early September.

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I support wholeheartedly the measure brought before us by the Committee on Public Works. Its distinguished membership has contributed a significant service, and the proposals of the majority members of the committee should prevail today. Those who would seek to cripple or to limit this bill are, despite what may be good intentions, working at cross purposes with the good of the Nation.

I find myself completely out of sympathy with those who charge the Congress with sponsoring pork-barrel legislation on the occasions when we attempt to develop the natural resources of the various States. Most of that same group are highly vociferous in their advocacy of free trade, foreign aid, and contributions to the District of Columbia. But they are wholly unable to comprehend the necessity for maintaining the strength of our own domestic economy through the development of new trade areas at home.

We have not had a rivers and harbors bill since 1954. Blame for this must be laid at the door of President Eisenhower,

whose advisers caused him to reject the predecessor of this measure. Now he has recognized the need for public works as a means of combating recession. I trust that he will see in this measure a broad and wise vehicle for stimulating progress in America.

There is under discussion today the question of the place of the Bureau of the Budget in Congressional decisions. All too often the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget have been held up to the Congress as the proper criterion for guiding our own course of action. This is entirely uncalled for. The Bureau of the Budget is a branch of the executive department of government. The Congress is not bound by its decision or its recommendations. In fact we abdicate our own responsibilities when we follow blindly the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and we fail in our opportunities to serve our own people.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will remember that this is a bill authorizing the Corps of Engineers to carry out an orderly course of development. There is not one iota of legislation in this bill applying to the reclamation laws or to the operation of the Department of the Interior, except an increase in basin authorization for the Missouri River. That is an item that has been traditionally handled under the Flood Control Act, and is the authorization of the project known as the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River. Two hundred million dollars is included in the bill for that project. It would authorize the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers to carry on currently work on the Missouri River and its tributaries.

I can see no reason for not having orderly procedure in the consideration of this bill. Why we should make declarations of State sovereignty and State law relative to operations of the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Reclamation I cannot see. There is nothing in the bill that goes to legislation on the proposition of the water laws in the various States. We have been very careful to see that we would not impose additional burdens upon either the operation of an agency or upon the States themselves.

So I hope we will resolve this proposition once and for all, because I do not know of any committee of the House of Representatives which has been more generous in their treatment of proposals in the reclamation States as evidenced by the fact we have already approved legislation authorizing over \$2,400,000,000 on the Columbia River alone. There never was a moment in the history of the committee since I have been a member that we tried to impose the laws pertaining to the Corps of Engineers in reference to flood control on the Reclamation Bureau. I hope there will be no further misunderstanding. The gentleman's amendment takes out an abstract proposition from a law

that was considered in connection with a public works project but was a question of substantive law which has no part in the legislation we are seeking to enact by this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman stated that there was not any reclamation in any of this. I direct the gentleman's attention to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and to section 8 thereof, where there is an authorization and where in this Flood Control Act a reclamation project may come into play. It is then passed to the Secretary of the Interior. Therefore, reclamation has a part in it. You will find that in the original Flood Control Act of 1944 the 98th meridian was referred to, that the Army Engineers as well as the Bureau of Reclamation were compelled to abide by the State water laws.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me say to the gentleman that there is nothing in the original bill that affected reclamation. If there was some question, it was resolved by the adoption of the amendment I have just offered and by the Baldwin amendment to the Mack substitute. It seems to me the proposition is clear that Flood Control Act sections 1 and 8 are still the law of the land notwithstanding the fact that we pass this bill. There is nothing in this bill to make the gentleman from Colorado fearful that we are going to do something any more than we did in authorizing flood control, navigation, the generation of hydroelectric power, or the impounding of water for municipal or other purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I take it, in the gentleman's opinion the amendments thus offered to the Mack substitute and to the Blatnik substitute which protects and sets forth sections 8 and 1 of the Flood Control Act do not disturb the water-right laws in any State west of the 98th meridian?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman most emphatically it would not and I am confident on the point that the members of the committee can assure the gentleman from Colorado and others that that is our purpose—to keep inviolate sections 1 and 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUDGE) there were—ayes 63, noes 84.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 33, strike out all of the language beginning on line 18 and ending on line 2, page 34, and insert "The project for the Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 9, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44,500,000."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is remove the language dealing with the Saylorville Reservoir north of Des Moines, Iowa, as contained in the Mack substitute and replaces it with the exact language as it appears in the committee bill. It results in this situation: The committee bill provides and authorizes the building of a dam without local participation. The Mack substitute would require 10 percent local participation. The Army Engineers favor it without local participation. The Bureau of the Budget wants local participation. The report of the committee favors it without local participation. My amendment removes the provision in the Mack substitute which requires 10 percent local participation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. In other words, the gentleman would change the language from that in the Mack bill to the language in the committee bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Just one more evidence—if the gentleman will pardon me, because I have the highest regard for him—of inconsistency. We have been trying to be consistent all the way through in the management of this bill, and if you will just stay with us and vote for the committee substitute, everybody in this country will be happy and the people will be put to work. That is what we want to do right now.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I just want to assure him I agree with him. I just do not want to take any chances, that is all.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to agree with my distinguished friend from Tennessee that he is being consistent, because last year he and the very same group recommended some projects that had not been O. K.'d by the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, and the President vetoed it. Now we have our distinguished friend doing the same thing this year. I agree with him. He is being consistent.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I would remind my good friend from Ohio that we did clean up this bill considerably; in fact, we cleaned it up to where we have now met the objections of the engineers by six-tenths of 1 percent, and I re-emphasize for the 50th time, I think, that we are now meeting the objections of the Bureau of the Budget, despite the fact that Mr. BUOCE's bill should be passed to abolish the Bureau of the Budget. We are meeting the objections of the Bureau of the Budget within 3.6 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to point out to my friend from Iowa, since he is worried about the bill, I do

not think there can be any possibility any more that the President would veto the bill, because his friends on that side of the aisle over there have all indicated that their arguments did not mean anything. They have accepted amendments right and left completely contrary to the initial position that they did sign. So I mean there is no position for the President to uphold any more. Consequently I do not think you have to worry about the President vetoing anything.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. So you can support my amendment and make it safe for me regardless of whether the Mack substitute or the committee bill is adopted.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Washington that the amount involved is \$300 million, or 20 percent, that is in controversy.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Not in my amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. No. In the bill itself. Rather than 3.6, there is 20 percent involved, and if the President is going to be consistent, he will veto this bill, and I think he will be consistent. I want to see a good public works bill, which is contained in the minority position. In regard to the water hyacinth control amendment, which is part of the hurricane program, it is a brandnew program which we are trying out as a new program in an effort to see how it works. That is the only reason why it and the hurricane program projects were agreed to by the minority.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand the gentleman's proposal is in the committee bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Exactly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman is trying to get it in through the back door.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I just want to play safe, either through the back door, front door or side door.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, which train is he going to ride?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I am not going to ride the one that will assure the same result as my amendment. The gentleman knows what that is and I ask his support.

The Saylorville Dam is in a different situation than most of the 18 projects referred to in the Mack substitute because the water storage it will provide was authorized many years ago when another dam was authorized for the same river south of Des Moines. It is therefore not precluded by any subsequent law, order or regulation. This is a water storage project for the entire Mississippi River Basin. It would be both unfair and inequitable, in view of past history, to require local participation in any amount. I will appreciate the Committee's support in seeing that

it is enacted as a straight project without local participation either with or without my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee) there were—ayes, 57, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Mack substitute amendment and any amendments thereto be closed at 2:30.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota will retain time for the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, if I may modify my request, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Mack substitute and any amendments thereto close at 2:30, and that the last 10 minutes be reserved, 5 minutes for the minority and 5 minutes for the majority.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we are now coming to an important vote on this bill on the question of whether we should accept the Mack substitute amendment. The Mack substitute amendment has as its objective removing from the bill projects which are believed by the minority to be objectionable to the President. While the President issued his veto message on the bill that was passed in the last session of the Congress, in which there was some \$500 million worth of projects objected to, in this bill there are \$303 million worth of projects which are equally subject to the President's objection. The Bureau of the Budget has been dragged across the floor here today. It has been used as a whipping boy. The Bureau of the Budget is not the whipping boy involved at all. The Congress of the United States instructed the Bureau of the Budget together with the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Interior, and the Federal Power Commission to write regulations and instructions as to how these projects should be judged on a long-range basis so that all projects would be judged on a fair and equitable basis. Based upon that instruction, the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Engineers, and the Department of the Interior, and the Federal Power Commission following those instructions have made these determinations. I urge the support of the substitute amendment.

#### UPPER FOX RIVER IN WISCONSIN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and also in the committee bill, section 108, provides for the transfer of the upper Fox Waterway to the State of Wisconsin. I would like to have the chairman of the committee tell me if it would be possible



for the Army Corps of Engineers to operate the Eureka Dam locks or must the State of Wisconsin operate the Eureka locks in the future, in the event the locks are operated.

Mr. BLATNIK. The State would be responsible for the operation and maintenance.

Mr. LAIRD. The State of Wisconsin?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota very much for this information.

Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], a member of the committee, tell me if the Wisconsin State government through its conservation commission, requests that the Corps of Engineers place the Eureka locks in operative condition, will this \$300,000 authorization cover this additional cost?

Mr. CRAMER. I know of the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] in the conservation and recreational potential of the upper Fox Waterway. The \$300,000 authorization would be sufficient to cover the cost of placing the Eureka locks in an operative condition should the State of Wisconsin request this work as a part of the transfer agreement.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress should be realists. We all know why the rivers and harbors bill was vetoed in 1956. Still some Members of the House want to take a gamble in sending a bill to the President which contains a number of unauthorized projects. In doing so, they are risking the chance of another veto. The sensible thing for us to do is to approve the Mack substitute for the committee bill. This will assure a clean bill containing only such projects as have been fully authorized and approved.

The Floyd River, Iowa, flood control project in my Congressional District is one of the clean projects in the bill which I want to protect. This project was in the bill vetoed in 1956, and I certainly do not want anything to happen which will jeopardize the authorization of the project this time. The thing for us to do is to adopt the Mack substitute and thus send the President a bill which he can conscientiously sign.

The entire Floyd River Basin, which is reported in House Document No. 417, 84th Congress and contained in S. 497, is located within my District. Therefore, I have had a keen interest in the Army Engineers' survey of the Floyd River and tributaries as well as a satisfactory solution to the flood control problems which have confronted my constituents for many years.

Flood control has been a perennial problem in the Floyd River Basin since 1892, and since that time there have been periodic disasters of considerable magnitude. Shortly after coming to Congress, I introduced a resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives on May 29, 1944, calling for

a review of the situation existing in the Floyd River Basin, with a view to determining if improvement in the interest of flood control would be feasible. Due to the fact that the United States was at war at that time, and because of the subsequent readjustment to a peacetime economy, it was not possible to begin active investigation of the Floyd River survey until June 1948. The investigation proceeded at a normal rate until it became necessary to suspend operations during the fiscal year 1950 because of inadequate funds. In view of the long period which has elapsed since the inauguration of this survey, I am immensely pleased that the report has been completed and that Congressional consideration is now possible.

Flood disasters have been very much in the news during the past several years. We in northwest Iowa can sympathize with the people of other sections of the country because we know from experience what an uncontrolled inundation of floodwaters can do to the life of a community. On June 8, 1953, the entire Floyd River Basin in northwest Iowa experienced the most disastrous flood in the basin's history. From the standpoint of both loss of human life and damage to property, this flood also ranks among the most disastrous floods of record for streams of its size in the entire Missouri River Basin. The Corps of Engineers estimated the damage at approximately \$25,603,000. No one will, of course, attempt to estimate the value of the lives lost during this disaster, a total of 14 individuals perishing in the Sioux City, Iowa, area. These victims were primarily elderly people who had lived in the flood area for many years but were unable to flee their homes fast enough to escape the advancing floodwaters. In the three major floods of the past 61 years in Sioux City, 45 people have been drowned. In the flood of 1892, 25 people lost their lives; 6 other lives were lost in 1926.

The damage caused by the flood of June 1953 greatly exceeded throughout the basin the damages caused by any previous flood. At Sioux City alone, a total loss of \$23,185,000 was approximately 20 times the damage reported for the floods of 1892 and 1926, despite the fact that the channel had been improved since those earlier floods. Approximately 90 percent of all the damage in the Floyd Basin from the flood of 1953 occurred in the city of Sioux City. Damage was extensive and severe because of the flash character of the flood, the impracticability of adequate warning of the impending disaster, and the unprecedented depths and velocities of the floodwaters within the city. In the city alone, 4,600 persons were evacuated from their homes and many others were evacuated from their places of business.

The Floyd River Basin is predominantly an agricultural area. Sioux City, however, which suffered the greatest damage in the recent flood, is the second-largest city in the State and the largest city in western Iowa. It is a major industrial, commercial, and transportation center. A substantial

part of the city's industrial and commercial developments and nearly all of its railroad yard facilities are concentrated within the flood plain of the Floyd River. Included are the Sioux City Stock Yards, major packing plants, major food- and equipment-manufacturing plants, large wholesale and distributing concerns, and a variety of lesser manufacturing, distribution, and service industries. Business and industrial flood damages are estimated to have been in the neighborhood of over \$16 million.

Keen interest in adequate flood control in the Floyd Basin has been displayed by all individuals in the area concerned. In 1953 and again in 1954, I called public meetings at Le Mars, Iowa, for the purpose of discussing methods of flood control and ascertaining whether or not public support would be assured. Representatives of the Army Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, cities and municipalities, and area farmers were encouraged to present their problems as well as their suggestions for solutions of the flood situation. At our meeting in 1954, representatives of the Army Engineers presented their plans for flood control and unanimous agreement was voted.

I cannot express too strongly, however, the need for adequate flood protection for the city of Sioux City and surrounding area. Notwithstanding the potential flood threat to the lives and properties of the people of this area, the possibility of the recurrence of a disaster similar to that of 1953 seriously handicaps the economic expansion of Sioux City. Industrial building sites are limited in the metropolitan area, and most of them are located in the Floyd River Basin of Sioux City, which is the area which suffers the greatest flood damage. This threat is keeping industry from moving into Sioux City, and not until adequate flood protection measures are taken can the economic and commercial expansion of Sioux City be assured.

The proposal in S. 497 we are considering today has the endorsement of the city of Sioux City as well as its chamber of commerce, and its civic organizations. It also has the approval of the Floyd Valley Watershed Association which is interested in control measures in the upper valley.

As indicated in House Document No. 417, 84th Congress, the estimated cost of this project is \$11,700,000, of which the Federal contribution will be \$8,060,000. Local interests in the area are prepared through bond issues and other means to contribute the non-Federal share of \$3,640,000. Local interests will also furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including rights-of-way for temporary ponding of interior drainage or provision of pumps to remove interior drainage over the levees; make necessary highway and highway bridge and utility alterations; remove buildings and other structures from within the rights-of-way limits; and maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. In addition, local interests will also provide in cash 0.84 percent of the total Federal first cost of the project, which is currently estimated to

be \$67,700, as recognition of the enhancement of land values which will result from the construction of the project.

Provision of flood protection at Sioux City, Iowa, is needed to prevent further loss of human life, property, and resources. Further delay in this authorization bill would be a serious handicap and injustice to the people in the area concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mack substitute for many reasons.

I think, first of all, it is imperative that we eliminate the pork that exists in the present bill, S. 497, which is before us for these reasons. Certainly, we have a number of public works projects already on the books in the construction stage at the present time. There are more than \$8,773,000,000 in public works projects already authorized and already started, but \$4,004,500,000 are needed to complete them. If the majority party wants to do something about public works projects in the United States, they have the majority on the Committee on Appropriations and they can do something. They have been doing a lot of talking about loading this bill down with pork barrel projects. If they authorize the construction of these projects and we get the money, we can have a public works program in the United States.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Could it be said that if the Mack substitute is not agreed today, the price of pork will have gone up?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. There is no doubt that the price of pork is going real high if S. 497 is passed.

And that high price of pork in public works projects is going to be reflected in the pocketbook of the American taxpayer. For the benefit of a few votes for a few Congressmen for a few doubtful projects, the majority members of the Public Works Committee are asking us to jeopardize the entire public works program.

Personally, I cannot see that type of reasoning, nor can I agree with that type of action. S. 497 is a deliberate attempt to shove through 18 questionable projects. The majority members of the House Committee on Public Works are daring the President to veto this bill. Personally, I hope the President takes the dare if S. 497 is approved.

Somehow, I was under the impression that some of the platitudes about Government economy and the elimination of waste which the majority Members of the House have been preaching back home to their constituents would rub off on them. Evidently, they have not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the entire 5 minutes, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] at this time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Is it not true, since there has been some comment made with regard to the position of the minority in regard to the acceptance by the minority of the hurricane program and the water-hyacinth project on a 75-percent Federal, 25-percent local participation, despite the objections of the Bureau of the Budget—is it not true that those two programs are clearly distinguishable from the other projects under discussion because, in the first place, these two programs are new programs, not subject to directive A-47—new Federal participation programs and the minority is willing to try these programs as recommended and fully studied by the Army Engineers, and that is the reason why the minority are willing to accept them as compared to the other projects which the minority is objecting to because they are a deviation by the majority in the committee, a deviation from the long-established principles and from the directives by the Bureau of the Budget that have been accepted by the Department of the Interior, by the Federal Power Commission and by the Secretary of the Army. There is nothing inconsistent with this position which resulted from a reconsideration of the minority position on hurricane projects as well as water-hyacinths.

Our objection is that these standards should be recognized and should be adhered to. Otherwise, one area is not treated equitably with another.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as supporting the Mack amendment as being a clean bill and the type of bill this Congress could well afford to pass at this time.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the House that it is my intention at the proper time to offer a motion to recommit. That motion will include the Mack bill, H. R. 11121, which we consider a clean piece of legislation and in conformity with existing law. May I say I am of the opinion that if the projects not in accordance with recommendation of Army Engineers and Bureau of the Budget remain in this legislation, if they are in there when it goes to the President, in my opinion you will be faced with the same condition we had last year; you will get a veto. Then approximately 120 good projects are going to go by the wayside because of the insistence of proponents of four or five projects. I hope you will not do that, because there are many good projects. I am hoping that we may give to the President a bill which he could sign and which would be in conformity with the law.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works, in reporting S. 497, is providing the greatest possible antirecession proposal that has been brought previously to the attention of the House. I commend the committee on its work which extended over a period of several months. The projects included in the bill were carefully screened by the committee. It is appropriate and fitting that this legislation be presented at this time and speedily passed. The recent report that there was upward of 5 million unemployed, and that that figure is apparently mounting, would indicate that it is time to move—and move fast—on the construction of public works projects in the field of flood control, river and harbor improvements.

The people of the great alluvial St. Francis Valley are indebted to the committee in recommending the authorization of an additional sum of \$35,674,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement in the St. Francis River Basin which was approved in the act of May 17, 1950. It is hoped that this St. Francis Basin—Missouri and Arkansas—project will move along faster, at a more rapid pace, than has been the case in the immediate past years. Some \$3 million in appropriations have been made annually for the past few years, but even that sum was cut back in the budget for fiscal year 1959 to \$2,800,000. In view of the tremendous flood losses in the valley as a result of excessive rainfall, it is most important that the project be expedited so that it may be completed at a much earlier date.

Thirty Rotary clubs in southeast Missouri and northeastern Arkansas have recognized the necessity of early completion of the St. Francis Basin project. Each of them passed suitable resolutions urging both Houses of Congress to increase the funds substantially and prevent the crop losses which have been suffered periodically by the people of this vast area. It is hoped that the Appropriations Committee will see fit to approve some four to five million dollars in the new fiscal year instead of the \$2,800,000 that has been recommended. In this project, local interests have contributed a total of more than \$66 million as against the contributions of the Federal Government of approximately \$35 million in the State of Arkansas. The State of Missouri has spent more than \$100 million together with the Federal Government's contributions.

The subcommittee and full Committee on Public Works approved the modification of the White River backwater project in Arkansas substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document 26 of the 85th Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$2,380,000 for construction and \$57,000 annually for maintenance. The construction would include the building of a pumping plant which original plans made by them Maj. Donald Connelly called for. This



project has been highly recommended by the Corps of Engineers and should be authorized in this legislation and the pumping plant built as expeditiously as possible. It is the purpose of the pumping plant, when completed, to provide a means of discharging impounded waters that are contained in a great sump area within the confines of levees.

Prior to the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, the landowners in the affected White River backwater area contributed \$4,500,000 for levee construction, rights-of-way, and front-line levees. The present White River Drainage District of Phillips, Monroe, and Desha Counties has contributed more than \$100,000 for rights-of-way, \$750,000 for interior drainage, \$450,000 for levee maintenance, and other expenditures, or a grand total of \$5,800,000. The Federal Government expenditures on the project have totaled \$8,400,000. The landowners of the district have more than borne their share of the costs for flood control on this project.

The pumping plant would prevent the flooding of lands during the flood stages of the Mississippi and White Rivers. The need for the pumping plant is undisputed and has not been successfully questioned. The project has been under study by the Corps of Engineers for many years. On reading Senate Document No. 26 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, which is the report on the lower Mississippi River area, including the White River backwater levee system in Arkansas, it is reflected that the project has one of the greatest benefit-cost ratios of any that has ever been brought to my attention. The estimated benefit-cost ratio is 2.3 to 1. Every landowner within the White River backwater area—to a man—has signed easement agreements, agreeing that their lands may be used in an emergency in case it may become necessary as a result of a great flood on the Mississippi River. The whole area would be used as a reservoir in that event, which would reduce the flood height on the Mississippi River from 6 to 12 inches. This ironclad agreement, approved by every landowner in the vast area affected, indicates fully the type of cooperation that is given this White River backwater project. In order to obtain the protection accorded by the project, the district and the landowners thereof were required to provide, first, levee rights-of-way; second, all necessary interior drainage; third, an easement across and over the lands for use as an emergency reservoir; fourth, maintenance of levees after construction; and, fifth, safety and protection of the Federal Government from any liability for damages should the area be used for reservoir purposes. The district has lived up fully to its agreement. This easement is a perpetual easement and one of the most all-embracing instruments that has ever been executed in the lower Mississippi Valley. These landowners were required to make a great sacrifice—and they did it gladly.

I concur wholeheartedly in the recommendations by this committee to incorporate the construction costs for the White River backwater pumping plant of \$2,380,000, and \$57,000 annually for maintenance, as a part of its omnibus

bill, S. 497. To pay the total cost of the pumping plant, as approved by the Public Works Committee, is in keeping with the policy set in connection with Mississippi River projects. I trust that the House will see fit to approve this great project, as well as the authorizations to complete the Lower St. Francis—Missouri and Arkansas—flood-control project.

Permission having been heretofore granted, I incorporate as a part of my remarks a telegram received from the White River Drainage District of Phillips, Monroe, and Desha Counties, Ark., and signed by the commissioners, the project engineer, and attorney for the district: The telegram reads as follows:

HELENA, ARK., March 4, 1958.

Congressman E. C. GATHINGS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

We have been informed that the omnibus flood-control bill, being Senate bill 497, will be brought up on the floor of the House for debate on Wednesday, March 5. We are very much interested in the White River backwater project, section 203, subsection (B) of the bill. This project has the unqualified approval of the Mississippi River Commission and the Chief of Engineers. The Budget Bureau and the minority report of the Public Works Committee have expressed opposition to the project because there was no evidence to show the local interests have contributed large sums of money toward the furtherance of flood control in Phillips and Desha Counties, Ark. Prior to the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, landowners in the district contributed \$4,500,000 for flood control. Our district has contributed upward of \$100,000 for rights-of-way, \$750,000 for interior drainage, \$450,000 for levee maintenance and other expenditures or a total of \$5,900,000 as compared to Government expenditures of \$8,400,000. The landowners of this district have borne more than their share of costs for flood control. We sincerely hope you will be in a position to support this project when it comes up for debate. Your efforts in our behalf will be greatly appreciated by the landowners of Phillips, Desha and Monroe Counties, Ark.

WHITE RIVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT OF  
PHILLIPS AND DESHA COUNTIES, ARK.

E. T. HORNER,  
OTIS W. HOWE,  
JOHN H. WOOD,  
Commissioners.  
E. G. GREEN,  
Engineer.  
J. G. BURKE,  
Attorney.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the distinguished and beloved Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard conversations this afternoon that, as a long-time Member of the House, and being proud of it and its instrumentalities, have been very distressing to me.

Have we come to the point where the membership of the House of Representatives, that studies a bill in the hearings, through executive sessions, and through main sessions on the matter, makes up its judgment that things should be done in the interest of the country, and then we are to be told that we should not pass this bill; it might mean a Presidential veto? Are we coming to the point where we just say "The President and the Director of the Budget will send up a recommendation. We will not change it. We will introduce a resolution saying 'approving'; period."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing further that can be said that has not already been said; in short, this bill is one of the finest, most seriously and thoroughly considered public works authorization bills that has been presented to the Congress in the 12 years it has been my privilege to be a Member of this body and of this committee. The areas of dispute are not serious, and we find here even members of the minority themselves yielding and conceding on the floor that there are cases where exceptions should be made to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and any doubt resolved in favor of the problem that may exist in a given locality or a given area.

I strongly urge that the Mack substitute be overwhelmingly defeated in order that we may in an orderly way proceed with the consideration of S. 497 as amended which includes all projects and which will be subject either to amendment or discussion at any point.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. In reading the bill I am somewhat confused with regard to the Shelbyville project on the Kaskaskia River. It was my understanding that that was not included in the original bill but that it is being included in the substitute with the proviso that the local interests must contribute additional money. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding of the gentleman's project.

In the Mack substitute they are trying to tie an amendment onto one project to alter or change the ground rules for a project further south and in another district, as I recall, that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] to change the repayment formula already previously established. It would cost the people of Illinois an additional \$7 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I wish to ask the gentleman with reference to the Millwood project that has the approval of the engineers and of the local people. That is in the committee bill, is it not? And it should be approved by this House.

Mr. BLATNIK. There we had a case wherein the earlier methods of computation of cost-benefit ratio worked out favorably, but in later applying the tax foregone principle it fell just a little below the margin required for economic justification.

#### HIDDEN AND BUCHANAN DAMS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, the arguments advanced against authorization of Hidden and Buchanan Dams are completely without basis of fact or logic. They are based on misinformation or lack of information. I do not question the sincerity of those who advance these arguments before this House, but I question their judgment in accepting completely untrue statements.

It is said that these projects have not been sufficiently studied.

The facts concerning study are that these dams have been recommended for construction by every responsible agency which has considered them and the responsible engineers have repeatedly declared they need no further study. These specific projects were recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1949 as a part of the comprehensive program for development of the water resources of the central valleys of California. Earlier, they were studied and recommended for authorization by the Corps of Engineers in 1948, 10 years ago, as a consequence of study authorizations of Congress extending back to 1936. More recently, the State of California has studied and approved construction of Hidden and Buchanan Dams as essential units of the State water plan and the State of California is officially urging Congress to authorize them as Federal flood-control projects.

Let us look at what has happened since the Army Engineers originally asked authorization. We have had two disastrous floods in 1950 and in 1955. Flood damage over this 5 years approached \$10 million—practically half of the total cost of constructing these two dams which would have avoided this damage. As a consequence, the Corps of Engineers has reviewed its studies and revised upward the original cost-benefit ratios. Instead of a ratio of 1.07 for Buchanan, the corps now finds a ratio of 1.60. The benefits of Hidden have gone up from 1.12 in relation to cost and now stand at 1.85. This becomes more significant when we realize

costs of these projects have practically doubled during the 10 years since their authorization originally was recommended. How much longer must these people wait while they helplessly watch their life savings periodically wiped out by floods?

The legislation before you thoroughly coordinates water conservation features of these dams with Bureau of Reclamation projects in the area. It provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall handle irrigation and water conservation features of the project and this insures that these dams will be operated so as to enhance and add to total water development for irrigation.

The legislation also forbids construction of these two dams until firm assurance of repayment of irrigation benefit costs are entered into by local interests. I am proud of the fact that the irrigation districts benefited have filed their resolutions indicating their willingness and intention of participating in repayment of costs properly chargeable to irrigation. If the districts and property owners do not enter into firm contracts, these dams will not be built and no Federal costs of construction will arise.

The plain fact is that no responsible agency or engineer questions the feasibility, practicality, or need for these dams. No responsible engineer says they need any further study before authorization.

These are good and sound projects, long delayed, and I trust you will now let them proceed.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Mack amendment generally, and specifically as it relates to the deletion of Hidden and Buchanan Dams in the State of California from S. 497.

In this instance we have two projects essential to flood control primarily, but also for water conservation in the great interior Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin of California. And in this case, recommended and approved by the Corps of Engineers but opposed by the Bureau of the Budget, ostensibly because they are projects on which reports are not considered by the Bureau as adequate basis for authorization.

I submit to this body that the hearings before your Public Works Committee provide all the evidence necessary to substantiate that the Budget is wrong and the Corps of Engineers is right, as is the committee in including these projects.

The favorable report by the engineers was submitted in 1948. It was made in every respect and detail the same as any investigation by the corps and contains the same type of facts and figures. The cost benefit ratio on Buchanan is 1.6 to 1 and on Hidden, 1.85 to 1. There is no disagreement with these factors, but a study of the hearings and the correspondence therein indicates Budget's real objections, which were summarized by one witness before the committee thusly:

I think it was due particularly to their feeling that more study should be given to the overall problem and the manner in which it would fit into the plans of the State of California and the Bureau of Reclamation, and there was some doubt as to the

arrangements for local cooperation for the irrigation features.

These objections have long since ceased to have any validity, if they had any in the first place.

They are specifically somewhat as follows:

First, the original objection of the Secretary of Army made in 1949, that the report did not justify these dams as a part of the comprehensive valley plan. It would appear this stems from preliminary comment of the State's department of water resources made in 1946, mind you, that the projects should be deferred until needed and justified for irrigation and flood control.

What has transpired since 1948:

In 1949 the Bureau of Reclamation recommended the construction of these dams as part of the valley basin plan.

Floods in 1950 and in the Christmas 1955 flood that struck our State, the area below these dams was flooded for days, doing untold damage and crippling highway and railroad transportation between northern and southern California. And in 1955, these dams were included in the State water plan for development of California water resources—the comprehensive plan previously considered necessary.

Budget takes no cognizance of these changes, of which they are undoubtedly aware, but repeat the same answer based upon facts long since changed.

Second, the willingness and ability of local interests to contribute to the conservation features of the project.

The committee has ample evidence of the willingness of local interests to cooperate. Further, the bill specifically requires assurances for repayment prior to starting construction, putting into the bill a condition precedent our Appropriations Committee would require anyway.

Thirdly, the Bureau demands the projects be authorized in accordance with the Folsom formula, that is, multiple purpose dams are the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation, and dams and other works exclusively for flood control are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

As many of you know better than I, this was an administrative compromise devised to resolve an interagency battle on the construction of specifically Folsom Dam. It cannot continue to be applied generally forever to present conditions to which it has no logical application. If extended to its logical conclusion, it means that this entire river basin would be caught in this interagency battle and essential flood control works lost in a jurisdictional hassle on the basis of formula and device of a dozen years ago. By its application the Army Engineers would be practically precluded from building dams for flood control in California.

The committee majority has correctly seen this is not an adequate answer to this region's pressing water problems. Here again is the application of a bare formula without regard for the real facts of the case. And the Interior Committee has also correctly estimated the problem since I am informed that the committee agreed in 1956 that these dams should be considered as part of the flood control



responsibility of the Committee on Public Works.

The Bureau of Reclamation is not now studying or even considering the study of these projects.

The Corps of Engineers has studied these projects. In their opinion, no further study is necessary or would provide anything needed to the determination of value and necessity of these flood-control measures.

If this area of our country is to have flood protection, this is the only way available to it, and the committee majority agrees this is the way to do the job. I ask your support of their position.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the immediate approval of S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill.

My interest in this legislation is a very personal one stemming from the fact that it includes increased authorizations for Success and Terminus Dams, two projects designed to serve the people of my Congressional District. I would like to review the history of these projects for the purpose of pointing up the necessity for speedy action on this bill.

Success and Terminus Dams were first authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 by a single authorization paragraph which classified them together for a joint authorization of less than \$5 million. This amount, even at that time, was demonstrably less than the total authorization needed if reference were made to cost studies of the Corps of Engineers. The continued increase in the index of construction cost since that time has made the initial authorization figure even more unrealistic.

The initial limited authorization posed no problem, as a practical matter, until the year 1956 following a repetition of previous disastrous floods. The basis for this statement is the fact that until 1956 only enough strength was mustered by the proponents of these projects to secure increments of planning money which were well within the initial authorization. In 1955 and 1956, however, devastating floods occurred on both the Tule and Kaweah Rivers which stimulated the proponents of the projects and the Corps of Engineers to the point that the Corps made its first request for construction funds. Such funds were granted by the Congress in 1956. The amounts granted, however, still did not violate the ceiling of initial authorization and our authorization problem was postponed, in effect, until 1957. It would not have existed at all had the President signed the Omnibus Act of 1956. This act included the necessary additional authorization for Success and Terminus on my initiative.

In the light of the Presidential veto of 1956 and the size of the appropriations in 1956 we were confronted with a real problem in 1957. Appropriations of the magnitude indicated for steady economical progress on these projects would have violated the ceiling of the initial appropriation and would, therefore, have been subject to a point of order. In the light of this fact the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate were kind enough to appropriate amounts in excess of said ceiling subject

to the condition precedent that such excess amounts could only be spent if and when the additional needed authorization was secured.

The ability to obligate and expend these amounts, therefore, depends upon the passage of authorization legislation such as is contained in S. 497, and such passage will be an immediate boon to such projects.

I endeavored in 1957 to secure special legislation relating to the authorization on these projects alone but I was unable to move the same because of the tradition that such authorizations are handled in an omnibus bill. I should note, parenthetically, that there are two other projects which are in an identical position of having appropriated money which cannot be spent by reason of lack of authorization. One of these is the Los Angeles flood control project in California and the other project is in Florida. These projects will receive the same immediate benefits as Success and Terminus from the early approval of this bill.

I regret the lack of earlier action on S. 497 or similar legislation affecting Success and Terminus Dams; however, I should point out that because of other events earlier action would probably not have changed the timing of progress on them. By other events I refer to ceilings imposed by the Budget Bureau on various departments of Government approximately at the time of adjournment of Congress in 1957 and to the later action of the administrative arm of our Government confining cash outlays to a proportionate division of cash income. I am advised that either or both of these factors in combination would have stayed progress on Success and Terminus Dams whether or not the necessary additional authorization had been secured.

Finally I would like to point out that there is no dispute over the need and value of the increased authorization contained in S. 497 for these projects. Such increased authorization has the approval of both the Budget Bureau and of the Corps of Army Engineers. They were contained in the bill of 1956 and in the present bill. Each project is a project currently under construction. No new start is involved. Delays would only serve to increase costs and project flood dangers which exist every year on a predictable basis.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, an important measure affecting the upper Mississippi River in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill under consideration here today is the Eau Galle River flood-control project. It is described in Senate Document No. 52, of the 84th Congress and was provided for by my bill H. R. 6959 introduced on June 22, 1955.

Of vital concern to residents of Spring Valley in Pierce County, Wis., this project also affords important protection to the lives and property of others downstream from that community.

For the past 16 years efforts have been under way to undertake positive action to protect residents of the area from flash floods which rise with deadly speed because of the geographical configuration

of the earth's surface at that particular spot. The Corps of Engineers has done a thorough job of surveying conditions and has recommended adoption of the project estimated to cost \$6,690,000 to build a reservoir in the vicinity of Spring Valley and to complete channel enlargement of the Eau Galle River and channel rectification work on Mines and Burghardt Creeks.

The Eau Galle River flows 50 miles from headwaters at Woodville, Wis., in St. Croix County southeast to a junction with the Chippewa River. The Eau Galle River drainage basin of about 230 square miles has about 90 percent of its area divided into farms averaging about 140 acres in size. The village of Spring Valley is located in a narrow valley of the Eau Galle River between steep limestone bluffs at a point where two creeks, the Mines and Burghardt, which drain small valleys to the west of the village, join the Eau Galle River.

Heavy rains to the north of Spring Valley cause the worst flood conditions when high crests on the two creeks merged with a high crest on the Eau Galle River at the junction point. River stages which normally vary by about 5 feet rise from 10 to 15 feet in a few hours and recede almost as quickly.

Only a constant awareness of this threat to life has helped keep the death toll low. Flood records dating back to 1894 record damages to roads, bridges, and business places. One death is directly traced to a flood in 1934 and two deaths are linked indirectly to a disastrous flood in September 1942.

Dates of maximum known floods, elevations of high water at mile 29.5 are listed in the following table:

Maximum flood data, Eau Galle River at Spring Valley, Wis.

Item	Elevation in feet above mean sea level 1929 adjustment (mile 29.5)	Discharge (second feet)
September 1942.....	926.0	33,000
September 1938.....	922.0	19,700
May 1942.....	920.5	15,000
October 1911.....	920.3	14,400
August 1907.....	920.0	13,600
April 1934.....	920.0	13,600
July 1903.....	919.0	10,900
June 1894.....	918.0	8,400
March 1901.....	918.0+	8,400
May 1901.....	918.0+	8,400
July 1923.....	918.0	8,400
June 1903.....	917.0+	6,400
August 1903.....	917.0+	6,400
July 1938.....	917.0	6,400
Flood stage.....	915.0	2,400

It is ironic to note that about 6 weeks after I supported this project before the House Public Works Committee, May 2, 1956, a typical spring flood ripped through Spring Valley on the night of June 16, 1956. Corps of Engineers experts surveyed the damage that time and found "flood damages at Spring Valley appear to have been caused primarily by overflows on Mines and Burghardt Creeks with damages totaling about \$100,000 and including losses due to flooding of about 25 basements, erosion of bridge abutments and streets, and considerable erosion and destruction of

retaining walls along the creek banks." I earnestly hope that action on the measure under consideration here today will eliminate the threat of flooding and the erosion of the area's public works resources in future years.

It was 1942 when the two worst floods hit the community of Spring Valley. The first followed an 8-inch rainfall in May. From 10 p. m., May 29, to 1 a. m. the next day high flows exceeded channel capacity on Mines and Burghardt Creeks, somewhat ahead of high water on the Eau Galle River. The peak discharge was about 15,000 second-feet. Homes, business establishments, and public buildings were damaged. Downstream, railroad embankments and highways were washed out, bridges damaged, and cultivated fields inundated.

The worst flood in the history of the river came on the night of September 17, 1942, when Spring Valley residents had just about cleaned up after the May flood. Some advance rains had raised the river level above flood stage when on the evening of September 17 a heavy downpour caused the river to rise to a record stage about 5.5 feet above the crest elevation of the May flood. The flood lasted about 16 hours reaching a crest of about 926 feet at 11 p. m. and returning to normal the next day. Maximum discharge at Spring Valley was about 33,000 second-feet and the flood volume represented a runoff of about 3.8 inches over the drainage area above Spring Valley. Few buildings escaped damage as the tide moved through the community at a height of about 9 feet above the elevation of the main business street.

That flood destroyed 16 homes and 19 business places completely. The average home and public building could not be reoccupied for about a month. Red Cross relief expenditures alone totaled \$25,000. There was Federal aid of about \$7,000 and 50 convicts from the State prison worked for almost 3 months on the cleanup that followed. Damages of that flood have been estimated at \$1,558,100 to Spring Valley, Elmwood 10 miles downstream, and the farms, roads, and bridges in the area. The cost of health and sanitation improvements for Spring Valley on the heels of the disaster was \$276,000.

Each spring and fall since that black night in 1942, residents of the area have feared another flood like that one. The Army Engineers in surveying the situation even considered relocating the village but costs of relocation are greater than flood-protection measures recommended. Besides, the residents want to stay in their town and the flood hazard for the rural community and Elmwood must also be alleviated.

People of Spring Valley have gone ahead with many of the proposals outlined by the Corps of Engineers as condition to the participation of the Federal Government in the project. The village has agreed to purchase the land for the reservoir. They have also agreed to have power lines, telephone lines, and roads relocated so that they will not interfere with the proposed dam and channel widening. Millions of dollars of improvements have been made in business

places, homes, utilities, schools, and industries of Spring Valley since the disastrous flood of 1942. These serve to demonstrate how highly the residents value their hometown and also that they are capable of carrying their share of the proposed flood-control project.

Mr. Chairman, this project dates back to October 28, 1941. The problem is too great for residents of the area to handle without Federal assistance. The Department of the Army, the Bureau of the Budget, the Wisconsin State Planning Board, the Interior Department, and the Department of Agriculture, all the Federal and State agencies involved in any way on the proposed flood-control project, concur in the views or have no objection. Certainly the evaluated benefits, as well as the intangible benefits of prevention of the loss of life, removal of hazards of epidemics, and protection of the general welfare and security of the residents are sufficient to justify the improvements.

Final action on this worthwhile project is long overdue. The innocent victim of a Presidential veto directed at companion measures, it has come back again for the consideration, and I trust the approval, of this body. If the original authorization by Congress in 1956 had been approved by the President this project might now be under way and contributing to the economy of workers in the area, as well as serving to protect the residents.

Mr. GRAY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. I have heard much here today about the Bureau of the Budget, the Army Corps of Engineers, whom I hold in high regard, but not one word has been uttered concerning the ability to carry out the provisions of this bill if the Mack amendments are adopted. As one who has a so-called objectionable item in this bill, I would like to state that my people in southern Illinois cannot—I repeat, cannot—comply with the provisions contained in the Mack substitute. I refer to the Saline River project in southern Illinois, where the Bureau of the Budget recommends that local interests contribute the sum of \$930,000 for so-called land enhancement. The Committee on Public Works, of which I have the honor of being a member, had the wisdom to reduce the cash contribution to \$233,000, an amount which may be within the ability of local interests to meet by making strenuous efforts. Testimony was presented to the committee that conclusively shows that the economy of the area is such as to prevent the large local cash contribution requested by the Bureau. If the unmerciful increase required by the Bureau of the Budget is insisted upon, there will be no project at all.

While I have the opportunity, I would like to reflect back just a few months ago to the last campaign when 19 na-

tional Republican speakers came into my District yelling "give Ike a Republican Congress so we can help the people of southern Illinois." Those speakers included the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, the distinguished minority leader of the House, Mr. MARTIN, and many others from both Congress and the administration. Yet today we find the entire Republican membership of the House voting to kill a southern Illinois project. Trying to demand that local people pay an additional cash contribution of \$697,000 if they are to have any protection of life and property from floods. My Republican friends remind me of two famous Elvis Presley tunes. One they played in my District just before election entitled "I Want you, I Need You, I Love You," and then today they are turning the record over and playing the other side entitled "I'll See You Later, Alligator." Because those promises of help have turned into opposition to everything proposed for the welfare of the people of southern Illinois, I urge the defeat of this substitute and the passage of the committee bill as amended by the amendment offered by my distinguished chairman, Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to voice my support for S. 497, which is under consideration and debate today. This bill contains many worthwhile flood-control projects, one of which is in the First District of Nebraska, affecting Salt Creek and its tributaries. Nearly 1600 square miles of the Salt Creek drainage area lie within this part of Nebraska, and the citizens there have a real and genuine concern because of the threat of frequent and severe floods.

Lincoln, the capital city of our State, is closely situated to Salt Creek and has frequently been damaged by flooding, along with many other smaller urban communities throughout six counties all within the radius of the Salt Creek drainage area. Most of the land within this watershed is well improved for agricultural purposes and on the average two or three damaging floods each year can be expected to take its toll of this rich soil, bring irreparable property damage, and possibly subject a great loss in human lives. The flood in May of 1950 was estimated to have caused damage of over \$1½ million in the city of Lincoln alone, and many lives within the Salt Creek watershed. It has been reliably estimated that the average yearly flood damages in the entire basin amount to an annual dollar figure of over \$2 million, based on 1954 price levels. A number of residences and many business and industrial establishments in Lincoln are constantly under threat of flooding by Salt Creek and its upper tributaries. This is applicable to every community on or near Salt Creek and its branches. Highways, bridges, and railroads which are the main line of transportation are constantly subject to damage by high water.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sound project from an engineering standpoint and the cost to the benefit ratio as computed by the Corps of Engineers is 1:1.60. Certainly this is a reasonable justification



for the expenditure of Federal funds to conserve lives and property.

May I say too, Mr. Chairman, that an excellent degree of cooperation exists and has existed among the people of the Salt Creek area and the Government agencies concerned. The Salt-Wahoo Association was formed to deal with the flood problems confronting the citizens of these six counties. Its membership is made up of people of this area whose objective, as a nonprofit organization, is to combat the constant erosion and flood damage that has been wasting the resources of a fertile agricultural area. This association has coordinated its activities with the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers. An integrated and well developed plan was the result. Every single agency of the Government concerned with this overall plan of improvement has given its wholehearted support and endorsement including the Bureau of the Budget. The House Public Works Committee in the 84th Congress and in this Congress have likewise endorsed this project as one meeting all of the necessary criteria for approval. In addition, Mr. Chairman, maximum advantage will be taken of Public Law 566 through the Soil Conservation Service to provide flood retardation and prevent soil erosion in the upland area. This work is already progressing at a very satisfactory pace. To properly give adequate protection to the people of this area it is necessary that larger flood-control structures be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers so that a comprehensive plan of improvement for the entire Salt Creek Basin can be accomplished. With coordination between the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture there will be no overlapping as each program complements the other.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that a project such as this is an investment in America. It will save human lives and property from further destruction. Last July, for example, 4½ inches of rain in Lincoln caused considerable flood damage. A flood-retarding dam on Antelope Creek, which this legislation would provide, might have prevented substantial property loss. The Salt Creek project is similar to many other sound and worthwhile projects contained in this legislation. Certainly we must not jeopardize unnecessarily our great program of public works at the risk of inclusion of projects within this measure, some of which may be of doubtful value. This must be a clean bill, as it will be if the Mack substitute is adopted and if it is to have the President's signature. That is a fact of which I am sure all of us are aware.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include for the RECORD several telegrams that have just come into my office from people of this area which point up this constant flood threat:

Understand S. 497, omnibus authorization bill, is coming up for debate in the next day or two. Please do everything you can to obtain passage of this bill. Salt Creek went out of its banks last week; a little more rain would have caused tragedy.

Residents of upper Salt area urge passage of S. 497, omnibus authorization bill. Less

than 2 inches of rain last week almost brought damaging floods. In the future disastrous floods are inevitable unless control dams can be built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time on the Mack amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for a division.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 102, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Blatnik amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 87, lines 3 to 9, strike out all of paragraph (f) and designate the paragraph beginning in line 10 as paragraph (f).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Mack of Washington amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that an identical amendment to that has been offered to the substitute which has just been disposed of by the Committee; therefore this amendment would be subject to a point of order, the matter having been already disposed of and voted on by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no page 87 in the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Page 32, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEX.

"Notwithstanding clause (b) of paragraph 5 of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 28, 1954, with respect to the project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, local interests shall not be required to pay any portion of the total cost of the project attributable to increase in net returns from higher utilization of the downstream valley lands."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on July 27, 1916, the Congress of the United States authorized preliminary examinations and survey of the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas. This act was further amended by the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 3, 1930, and by the Flood Control Acts approved May 31, 1924, and June 22, 1936.

As a result of this survey of the Trinity River, there was recommended by the Corps of Engineers the construction of five reservoirs and two floodway projects.

The Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, called for the construction of the

Lavon Reservoir, located north of Dallas on the East Fork of the Trinity River; the construction of the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, located above Dallas and Fort Worth on the Elm Fork of the Trinity River; the Grapevine Reservoir, located north of Fort Worth on Denton Creek; the Benbrook Reservoir, located south and west of Fort Worth on the Clear Fork of the Trinity River. The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized the construction of the Navarro Mills Reservoir, located on Richland Creek within the Trinity River Basin.

At the present time four reservoirs have been completed, the Lavon Reservoir, at an approximate cost of \$11,160,000; the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, at an approximate cost of \$22,100,000; the Grapevine Reservoir, at an approximate cost of \$8,166,000; and the Benbrook Reservoir at an approximate cost of \$10,950,000. All of these projects were initiated in 1947 and 1948.

The Navarro Mills Reservoir, which is located within my District, was authorized in 1954. During the time that the district engineer was preparing his final studies of this project for submission to the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget issued its circular No. A-47, dated December 31, 1952, which was designed to set forth the standards and procedures to be used by the Executive Office of the President in reviewing proposed water resources projects for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of local participation in the construction of such projects.

The district engineer, in accordance with this circular, recommended that local interests be required to pay an amount equal to 11 percent of the cost of the project, based on the increased use of downstream valley lands which would be enhanced by the construction of the Navarro Mills Reservoir.

Section 3 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved June 13, 1902, created what is known as the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. This Board is made up of seven members, that is, a chairman and a resident engineer who acts as secretary to the Board, both appointed by the Chief of Engineers, and the other five members are the five division engineers located throughout the United States.

The purpose of this Board is to review all reports on projects which the Chief of Engineers plans to submit to the Congress for authorization. The purpose of this review is to determine whether or not the economic justifications for the projects are sound and whether or not any modifications should be made in the district engineer's and Chief of Engineer's reports.

In the instance at hand the Chief of Engineers included in his report the recommendations of the district engineer calling for a payment by local interests of 11 percent of the cost of the project for land enhancement. Insofar as I can ascertain, Mr. Chairman, this is the only flood control project authorized by this Congress which contained these requirements. In fact, I have reviewed all of the authorizing House documents for the other projects included in this bill,

which projects were authorized subsequent to Navarro Mills, and not a one includes local payments based on land enhancement.

As further proof of the infeasibility of this recommendation, I quote from the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors following their review of the district engineer's and Chief of Engineer's reports:

The Board, however, questions the requirement of a contribution by local interests because of prospective benefits from the higher utilization of downstream lands. These benefits would accrue entirely to agricultural lands and their realization would require a substantial investment on the part of landowners to convert grazing lands to productive croplands. The landowners would not profit immediately since in many cases the benefits would not materialize for many years. While the reporting officers have evaluated these benefits only for the lands along Richland Creek, similar benefits, though to a lesser extent, would accrue along the main stem of the Trinity River. In view of the widespread incidence of the benefits in the varying degree of applicability to the various landowners, the Board considers that the requirement of a contribution on account of benefits from the higher utilization of downstream land is not feasible for this improvement.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of the House that there are two other requirements of local participation insofar as this project is concerned which require that local interests pay an amount equal to 25 percent of the total cost of the project for conservation storage space provided in the reservoir, and also that local interests assume 25 percent of the annual cost of maintenance and operation of the reservoir, payable in one lump sum on a capitalized basis or annually, and local interests are prepared to meet these two requirements.

Construction of this much-needed reservoir as a portion of the overall improvement plan for the Trinity River has been delayed because of these requirements, and it is for this reason that I urgently request the Members of this House to adopt my amendment in order that this worthwhile project may proceed in an orderly fashion and on the same basis that the other projects on the Trinity have been constructed.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In other words, the gentleman from Texas has the same situation that we have up in southeastern Oklahoma and southwestern Arkansas, in the Millwood project where, if we exact this requirement for local contributions, the project will not be built.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not familiar with the project the gentleman mentioned, but as I understand, this is the only project where land enhancement below the dam has been placed in a project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The committee recognized that situation and did not include the contribution for land enhancement in the Millwood project, and I think the gentleman has a very good amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that we are very much interested in his amendment, and we think it is a proper one, because the Corps of Army Engineers favors it.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to point out that this project was heard before the committee when it was initially authorized in 1954. It is not a question of something just coming up, and in accepting the amendment, the committee is informed about the details of the project very clearly.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman's amendment is identical in all respects to the other land enhancement amendments which, according to the directive of the Bureau of the Budget under the Truman administration, has been in effect since 1952. Under Budget Order A-47 a certain portion of land enhancements are charged to landowners who receive the windfall benefits from these projects. On that basis we are opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is there any other project that the gentleman knows of where the Board of Rivers and Harbors said the local enhancement should not be placed in there because it was not feasible?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This was opposed by the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers on the ground of enhancement.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But the gentleman well knows that the Board of Rivers and Harbors, made up of five division engineers of the United States, in their report said it was not feasible. Of course, the Bureau of the Budget told the Chief of Engineers to put it back in there.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army are opposed to projects of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 32, lines 1 to 7, strike out all of paragraph "(f)" and designate the paragraph beginning in line 10 as paragraph "(f)."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment has the same purpose and

the same, identical result as the Mack substitute, which has been voted down. We are voting twice upon the same language, the same point made by the gentleman from Alabama a moment ago. The same lines and item are in the Blatnik amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this relates to the Greenville project on the lower Mississippi estimated to cost \$2,534,000. This project is not approved by the United States Chief of Engineers. It is not approved by the Secretary of the Army. It is not approved by the Budget Bureau. The only member of the United States Army Engineers who approved this project was the division engineer in the district where the project is proposed. There have been no hearings before our Committee on Public Works on any aspects of this project. There is no testimony before the committee to show the nature of this project. We on our committee do not know whether it requires dredging or jetties, whether that harbor is used by small fishing craft, the yachts of wealthy sportsmen, or by large commercial ships.

There is no testimony before the committee except 30 lines in hearings that extended over many weeks. The only place where you will find the word "Greenville" in the entire hearings of the Public Works Committee is a little conversation in 30 lines that was carried on between the gentleman from Mississippi and the Assistant Chief of Army Engineers. In that conversation the gentleman from Mississippi asked the Assistant Chief of Engineers, "Have you received a report on the Greenville project?" The Assistant Chief of Engineers replied, "No." The gentleman from Mississippi said, "General Harding told me that he had sent the report to the Chief of Engineers." The Assistant Chief of Engineers replied, "The report has not been officially received. We know that it has gone from the division engineer to the Mississippi Valley Commission. We have received a copy of it, but that copy has not been studied by the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of Engineers has never made a report on the project."

The President of the United States in his veto message called attention to the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1954, and this was the basis of his veto of many of the projects in that bill. He said:

No project or any modification not authorized as a project for flood control or rivers and harbors shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report on such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

I know the project the gentleman has submitted, according to the district engineer, has a very high benefit-cost ratio. I rather suspect that this is a good project. If it goes through the regular procedure it might be approved. We, in this Congress, certainly should not throw away the rule book in order to place a project into a bill when that project has no approval except by the division engineer and has never been before the



United States Army Chief of Engineers, never before the Budget, and never before the Secretary of the Army for their comments.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some corrections, first of all, in the statements made by the gentleman from Washington. First of all, he says that this has never been reported by anybody but the District Engineer. The report was submitted by the Division Engineer. It has been before the Chief of Engineers and contrary to what he says, it has been inspected by our committee. It has not gone through the process of transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget because it was put in the bill prior to the time that it would normally have been presented to the Bureau of the Budget, and because of that the office of the Chief of Engineers withheld action on it since it would have been wasted effort to go through the motions on this item since it was in the process of being authorized at any rate. That is why all this costly paperwork has not been ordered since that time. I would like to point out that this project, as testified to by the Assistant Chief of Engineers speaking for the Chief of Engineers, has a 4.51 to 1 benefit-to-cost ratio; and that benefit-to-cost ratio exceeds 90 percent of all the projects that we have authorized in this bill or in past bills. It is more than twice the benefit-to-cost ratio that has been considered to be very generous by the gentleman from Washington himself.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I regret that it has been necessary for the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to have to restate, and I think this is about the third time, the facts in connection with this Greenville Harbor project. The gentleman from Mississippi is one of our most dedicated members of our Committee on Public Works and on the Subcommittee on Flood Control. He has had Members from both sides of the aisle to go to the city of Greenville to make a personal examination and inspection of the project. I can say that all of us at that time were satisfied when we heard the recommendations of the engineer there, and the division engineer, and knowing full well that the gentleman has stated all the facts in connection with it, and since we saw at firsthand the worthiness of this project, and since we know that the Mississippi River is carrying a tremendous amount of traffic today—I might add, in passing, that there is a harbor in my city which is a very profitable one, and there has been one authorized at Vicksburg, Miss., and the river is carrying this traffic, and since, of course, the whole theory behind flood control is to permit the rivers to serve the people of the country—I hope that at this very time the gentleman from Mississippi will not say another word in connection with this matter because we

know that he has the confidence of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 85—

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that there is no page 85 in the Blatnik substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: Page 31, line 12, strike out "\$1,212,000" and substitute the following: "\$631,000: *Provided*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 48 percent of the cost of providing major drainage in cash or equivalent work, to furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, and to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. As I understand, the amendment is in the same language as the Mack substitute. Therefore, the proposition has already been decided by the Committee and the amendment has been rejected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman is correct, except that it is now offered as a specific proposition, and under the ruling previously made the point of order is overruled.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those projects which is disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget, disapproved by the Secretary of the Army, disapproved by the Army Engineers, on the basis that there is no provision for adequate payments by landowners for land enhancements which enrich these landowners, and them alone.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Chief of Engineers recommended this project in the form contained in the Blatnik bill. The difference is between the corps and the Budget, and the committee took the corps' proposition.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The budget issued Directive No. A-47, which provided that at least half the cost should be paid by those who received windfall benefits from land enhancement. The most of these projects that involve land enhancement would not be economical projects and would not come within the usually recognized 1-to-1 ratio of benefits to cost unless we considered land-enhancement values that would result in a profit to the landowners.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman intend to offer every item as a separate amendment to that contained in the substitute which was just defeated by the Committee?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I will submit this project, since it involves the land-enhancement issue. Then I will submit all of the other land enhancements, and the House may consider them as one amendment, and without further discussion. I want to keep the record straight.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It seems to me that the purpose of the substitute was to expedite consideration of the bill. Since the vote recurred on his amendment and it was rejected, that I thought would resolve the issue with respect to the particular items in the bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I desire to make the position of the administration perfectly clear.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understand the gentleman's position and the party's position. It is very clear and concise. I was just hoping we could go ahead and conclude consideration of the bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Blatnik amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment, as reported, to provide for the modification and extension of the plan of the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon Basin, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as outlined in House Document No. 108, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,212,000.

May I inform my colleagues that this particular amendment provides for carrying out recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for flood control and major drainage work in that portion of the Boeuf, Tensas and Bayou Macon Basin that is in the State of Arkansas, to the north of the 5th Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the great honor to represent in this House. The carrying out of the plan of improvement, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, is of vital importance to the areas affected, both in Arkansas and Louisiana.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the Boeuf, Tensas and Bayou Macon Basin project is a highly significant phase of the invaluable total program for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, which, on the whole, has a benefits to costs ratio exceeding 4 to 1.

It would be nothing short of foolhardy false economy to unnecessarily delay any of the recommended phases of this constructive and profitable flood protection and resources development plan.

I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. If I understand the gentleman's question, it can be answered by referring the Committee to Public Law 150, page 11, subparagraph (c) where you will find the project authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

I am going to say but one thing further: I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I may say that I have several amendments of the same nature which I intend to offer. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be considered en bloc.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman from Washington to conclude the section on flood control with these amendments?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We have some other amendments but we want to have them considered en bloc as much as possible.

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

There was no objection.

Amendments offered by Mr. MACK of Washington:

Page 30, line 4, substitute the figure "\$14,445,400" for the figure "\$19,199,000", change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Page 35, line 9, strike out the figure "\$3,152,000" and insert "\$3,103,000."

Page 35, line 3, strike out the figure "\$2,066,000" and insert "\$1,792,000."

Page 30, lines 24-25, strike out "\$2,380,000 for construction and \$57,000 annually for maintenance" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,613,000."

Page 31, line 6, change the period to a semicolon and add the following proviso: "Provided further, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 31.2 percent of the cost of the project in cash or equivalent work, and to operate and maintain the pumping plant after completion."

Page 4, line 25, substitute the figure "\$5,272,000", change the colon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further comments inasmuch as these involve the same principle as the previous amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Washington that no more can be said than has already been said. I ask for a vote on the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCUDDER to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Page 4, line 20, insert after the colon and before the word "Senate" the words "Future maintenance in accordance with"; and in line 11 change the comma after the word "Congress" to a colon, strike out the remainder of the line and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That local interests shall not be reimbursed for funds contributed for this improvement."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is the same item contained in the Mack substitute that the committee has already acted on.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair has already passed on that question. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, this is a somewhat different project than has been discussed previously. The recommendation and the comments by the Bureau are negative and I desire to quote from the report of the Bureau of the Budget:

There is no objection to submission to the Congress but would recommend against authorization unless Federal participation is limited to 50 percent of the cost.

The Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway was authorized for a 32-foot project. It happens that a very large concern is operating in that area and they took it upon themselves to deepen the channel to 36 feet without any Federal authorization and expended \$950,000 to do the job. They are asking in this bill that the Congress authorize that amount of money to reimburse them.

If that is the type of legislation you desire to enact you have a perfect right to put your stamp of approval on it, but I feel that we have a responsibility to authorize a project before we enter into its construction. It is a matter of principle. I know you have the votes. You are all very fine gentlemen. We should stand up and be counted, but I do not believe this is a proper way to handle these types of projects, permitting public or private entities to dredge a channel and then come to the Congress to authorize the project and later appropriate money to make a refund.

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

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, these things always hurt when they hit at home. As a Texan, I believe this is a bad precedent, I think economy ought to start at home. Therefore I join the gentleman in saying I do not believe this Federal payment to the State is warranted under the circumstances.

Mr. SCUDDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise here to oppose the amendment and welcome the opportunity to correct some of the misstatements that have been made by the minority in connection with this particular amendment.

It was stated that a large firm has invested its money in the channel improvement. That is the first thing I want to correct before the committee. I was County Judge of Nueces County, the county in question at the time this improvement was made and am familiar with the facts. The Nueces County

Navigation District, which is a subdivision of Nueces County, constructed this improvement and did it with a bond issue. The majority of the committee in its report states it cannot understand why the Secretary of the Army and the Budget Bureau did not approve this project which is before the Committee at this time. Certainly the question is well put. Let me tell you why, Mr. Chairman.

The La Quinta project—extending from the main channel of the waterway a distance of five and two-thirds miles to a turning basin near La Quinta—was authorized in 1954 to a depth of 32 feet and width of 150 feet, at an estimated cost of \$1,800,000. The authorization provided that the Federal Government and local interests would each assume half the construction cost.

The need for this channel was so urgent, however, that local interests immediately constructed it with local funds—to a width of 125 feet instead of the 150 feet provided in the authorization—at a cost in excess of \$1,350,000. Local interests thus spent not only the \$900,000 to which they were committed under the authorization, but also more than \$400,000 of the Federal Government's share of \$900,000.

Since commerce using this branch channel became considerably greater than anticipated, and since many costly groundings resulted from the inadequate 125 feet width, local interests then beseeched the Federal Government to appropriate its remaining \$500,000 to complete the project to its authorized width of 150 feet. This sum was appropriated in 1956.

Before this appropriation of \$500,000 could be expended, however, the Corps of Engineers, responsive to a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee, was completing a survey which disclosed the need of a further increase in dimensions.

It became evident to both Federal agencies and local interests that considerable money could be saved if the dredging of the new proposed dimensions could be accomplished simultaneously with the dredging provided for by the \$500,000 appropriation. Though the new dimensions had not yet been authorized, the need for the deeper and wider channel was so urgent that local interests undertook to bring about the savings by making available the funds to complete the entire project.

On August 24, 1956, General Services Administration urged local interests to proceed with this project in order to obviate the necessity of hauling 1,750,000 tons of ore by truck 14 miles from the main turning basin at the Corpus Christi Port to its stockpile site on La Quinta Channel. This program is now in progress, and is saving the Federal Government more than \$5 million, or about double the cost of the entire project.

The entire project eventually cost \$2,979,200, which amount was to have been borne equally by local interests and by the United States, or \$1,489,600 by each. Local interests, however—by advancing funds in order to effectuate substantial savings to both the Federal Government and local interests—had actually con-



tributed \$2,443,000, or \$953,400 more than the amount of their fair and equal contribution. It is this sum which should rightfully be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The Chief of Engineers, in his formal report to the Secretary of the Army dated March 6, 1957, stated that the procedure proposed and prosecuted by local interests was "a sound business-like undertaking," adding that "the unusually high benefit-cost ratio of approximately 12 to 1 substantiates this conclusion."

I say to you that when the Secretary of the Army or the Bureau of the Budget or my colleague from Texas says that this is undesirable precedent, it is a sorry day for this country when it becomes undesirable and sets an undesirable precedent for our Government to live up to its moral obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sending two amendments to the desk involving the same principle, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CRAMER:

Page 34, line 13, delete "\$57,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000"; in line 16, change the comma after the word "Congress" to a period and strike the remainder of the sentence, through line 22.

Page 33, line 2, strike out "except as follows:" and substitute a period for the comma after the word "Arkansas" and strike out lines 3 to 13, both inclusive.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, these two amendments involve very fundamental principles in regard to this legislation, and I think it clearly indicates that the position of the minority is sound, for two reasons:

The first reason is that these questions involved are highly technical. The questions involved in this instance are questions of taxes forgone, the question of the incremental method of computing certain allocations of Federal and local participation in hydroelectric projects. It indicates, in my opinion, why in the first instance this type of hit-or-miss consideration should not be given to these questions that are so fundamental but rather through a thorough study by a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee determining whether basic changes in policy should be made and direct the Bureau of the Budget to apply these across the board. The second reason is that the bill as reported is contrary to established standards and I repeat again that A-47, the Bureau of the Budget directive, resulted from instructions from the United States Congress that these questions be decided in meetings with the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, and the Federal Power Commission in an effort to set out ground rules under which all these projects would be con-

sidered on a fair and equal basis. Having set out these ground rules as they relate to these particular projects, the Bureau of the Budget, and following these instructions, the Army Engineers, determined that taxes foregone should be included. The second thing that they determined was that it was necessary and proper not to use the incremental method but rather to use the separable-costs-remaining benefits method of determining what portion of the project cost should be allocated for Federal and what portion for local participation. This is indeed a technical question.

It is so technical that I inserted in the RECORD yesterday beginning at page 3803 a discussion of these very fundamental issues involved in these two multiple-purpose, including hydroelectric, projects.

Mr. Chairman, you will see by the majority report on page 51, in the remarks, there was a great deal of effort on the part of the majority to try to justify its position of eliminating taxes foregone as a determining factor in determining cost benefit. The result of eliminating taxes foregone is that a project that otherwise would be bad, would not have a 1-to-1 cost-benefit ratio, would get a cost-benefit ratio of better than 1-to-1. So the objective is to make these three projects, hydroelectric and reservoir projects, economically feasible when they otherwise would not be, contrary to the directive A-47, contrary to the agreement of the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, and the Federal Power Commission, as well as the other agencies that have the responsibility in this field.

In that report on page 51 the majority itself admitted with regard to the question of taxes foregone that—

This method of measuring the value of power led inevitably to the point that power values were not measured correctly unless the element of taxes, interest rates, and all other factors were included in the computation. As a result, the major Federal agencies—

And I repeat this—

the major Federal agencies concerned with this matter—the Federal Power Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers—reached an agreement that taxes foregone would be included as a part of the value of power on the benefit side of the ledger or subtracted from the cost side.

I say to you that that standard should if we are to have uniformity, be observed now and in the future unless the directive is changed and that we are deviating, if we do not accept this amendment, from that standard which has been set up through the direction of Congress.

The second problem involved is with respect to the question of what formula should be used in these projects in trying to determine what the local cooperation should be. There is, of course, the question of land enhancement, but the fundamental question is, What formula should be used in determining what the local participation should be.

These are multipurpose projects. There are three purposes for these projects. There are water power itself,

water conservation, and flood control involved in these projects. And the purpose of the directive A-47 that has been worked out very carefully is to make sure that the local costs with regard to these three factors are properly allocated, and are not loaded down on the flood-control aspect which is mostly paid for by the Federal Government, thereby decreasing the amount of money that would have to be paid by the local agencies. That is the sole issue involved. In other words, by taking a new formula, which is not used in this type of project at all—there is no precedent for it—the incremental method, it means that the Federal Government has to pay another \$15 million in one of these projects costing \$57 million which otherwise would be paid locally.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. HIESTAND. 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. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, spending more and more Government spending to pull us out of the slump seems the universal cry, but is that the answer?

Remember the disastrous thirties when we tried every spending scheme anyone could dream? We debauched our currency "to make more dollars available" and what happened? We simply stretched out the depression until there were 9½ million unemployed in 1939 and it took a war to get them work. Then we doubled our Federal debt between 1932 and 1939 without recovering and started the inflationary spiral not halted until 1953. Mr. Speaker, why should we try again a proven failure?

Why not an immediate general across-the-board tax reduction, which has invariably been successful in pulling out of a recession, notably in the 1920's and in 1954.

Our general tax structure, a carry-over from prewar and wartime measures is, in my judgment, one of the major causes for the present business slump. The personal-income tax hits almost everybody and since it must be paid, simply takes away nearly \$40 thousand million worth of purchasing power from individual citizens. That tax bite, although distributed over 60 million people, prevents many of them from buying things they want and in most cases need, because inflation has driven up the prices higher than they can pay. Inflated prices, forced by coerced wage increases without increased production, has reduced the sale of many lines of goods, and that is causing the business slump.

Furthermore, money for investment in expanded plants and equipment, creating more jobs, has been siphoned off from the upper income brackets by the graduated income tax and many businesses, especially small businesses, have been unable to finance expansion and the creation of more jobs. In fact, in many cases, especially in small business,

it has forced a cutback in business and part of the unemployment situation. General income-tax relief on a percentage basis, the same way taxes were increased, is sound and should come as immediately as possible.

Corporation income tax, accounting for over \$20 thousand million of revenue, has, especially in the upper brackets of more than 50 percent, encouraged inflation by encouraging waste expenditure. The spending is simply known as "tax money," since Uncle Sam put up over half of it. Inflation thus occurs and feeds upon itself. Reduction of corporate income tax would enable companies to put a much larger part of their earnings into expansion and the creation of more jobs.

Excise taxes, actually a vicious carry-over from wartime when they were used to restrict travel, communication, and so forth, certainly should be repealed, but with restrictive measures, if possible, that prices be reduced with them. This would tend again to make automobiles and durable goods within the means of the hard-hit consumer, especially those in the lower income bracket.

We must realize that only people pay taxes—automobiles do not pay them, corporations do not pay them, airplanes do not pay them, but the people buying the products or services pay them. They are reflected in the cost of living and if the people are relieved of these high costs they have a chance to buy more goods, thus increasing sales volume and creating more jobs.

Tax reduction is sound and will go a long way toward preventing a recurrence of such a business slump and unemployment.

Of course, with such a reduction must—simply must—come expense reduction, and "there's the rub."

Mr. Chairman, everybody approves expense cutting in the other fellow's pet projects. Is it not important enough right now seriously to tackle a real across-the-board expense cut?

To those who urge more spending projects to end unemployment, let me suggest that new projects are mostly construction projects, and the auto workers, airplane workers, parts makers, and electronics experts, very few of them, can do concrete, masonry, carpentry, earth moving, and other construction work. Actually there is very little unemployment in the construction industry. The only sure way to employ the unemployed is "make work" or charity projects such as leaf raking and WPA, and the unemployed today do not want that.

Tax reduction, on the other hand, simply must be accompanied by expense reduction. Otherwise the deficit spending, highly inflationary, defeats the object we seek—namely, stability.

Planned spending on civil public works certainly should, in accordance with the President's recommendation, be reduced, not increased. Many so-called Federal-aid projects, worthy in the long run, can be deferred. Nonessential new starts can be eliminated entirely.

The "spenders" have concocted all manner of new projects and arguments for old ones. Many are logical and pow-

erful arguments. But they must be met and overruled if we are to save our country from that most dangerous inflationary spiral induced by deficit financing.

It is a tough job, but I believe it can be done.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. I want to begin my remarks by expressing my appreciation to the Committee on Public Works and to its distinguished chairman and to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill. They have worked long and hard on this matter, and they have brought to us a bill which I think we should all support.

I cannot remember a time when a committee has gone so far to cooperate with the administration in working out an acceptable bill. I was amazed to learn from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that more than 96 percent of the projects in this measure have had approval of the Bureau of the Budget. It seems to me that if the Congress went any further than that it would be abdicating its legislative responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government.

The pending amendment would strike from the bill a modified project consisting of some 8 reservoirs, 4 of which are located in my District and 4 in the District of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. This is a modification of the authorized Millwood Dam in Mr. HARRIS' District. The report of the Corps of Engineers states that the project has the very fine cost-benefit ratio of 1.47 to 1. All of the reservoirs in this system except one have been approved by the Engineers. The other reservoir, known as the Sherwood or Narrows Reservoir, would have been approved by the Corps of Engineers except for present criteria of the Bureau of the Budget pertinent to power dams. Studies conducted by the Army Engineers and other agencies of the Federal Government have testified emphatically to the soundness of this project. General Itschner in his appearance before the committee commented that if considered without taxes foregone, the Sherwood project, together with Broken Bow, of which it is a part, would have the favorable cost-benefit ratio of 1.11 to 1. The so-called taxes foregone policy, which kept the Engineers from recommending this project, is not a part of any law enacted by the Congress. It is not something that this Congress has ever agreed to or adhered to or given any indication that it intends to adopt.

The further objection contained in the minority report that the Sherwood project was not supported by a formal, detailed written report from the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, when the Chief of Engineers himself was before the committee and described it at length, is in my opinion so technical and without substantive merit as not to be worthy of the serious consideration of this House.

The Sherwood Dam is a needed project in the overall picture. It will provide additional flood control and additional

water storage which is badly needed in this area. It is fully justified under the practices carried out by this Congress for more than 40 years.

With respect to the remaining projects no question has been raised as to their feasibility or desirability. The need for flood control in the area is urgent. Nobody disputes this fact, not even the Bureau of the Budget. Figures furnished by the Chief of Engineers in testimony before the committee show that this area has an average of 6 or 7 floods each year. This is mountainous country and the average annual rainfall exceeds 45 inches. There is no question about the need for the water which will be impounded in these dams or the availability of a market for it. The Chief of Engineers testified that this was the finest, purest water available in the entire area and that municipalities and industries would be clamoring for it before the dams were completed. The State of Oklahoma, through its Governor, has underwritten the water storage provisions of this legislation.

Now come objections to these projects not on their feasibility or merits but because of the form in which the committee has recommended their authorization. The committee has provided that in these projects land enhancement benefits should be nonreimbursable and the incremental method of cost allocation should be used. In other words, the committee has simply said that what Congress has done repeatedly in all sections of the country to the tune of billions of dollars should also be done here.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the economy of the area could never support the burden of land enhancement payments and should not have to do so in order to get the relief that is needed and deserved. These people last year suffered one of the worst floods in history. The income in McCurtain County in which these projects are located averaged \$799 per capita last year. The relief rolls in this county are the second highest in the entire State of Oklahoma. Twenty-four percent of the population of this county are receiving cash public welfare payments and 27 percent are receiving commodities. If you require a cash contribution for these projects from these people then you have killed the projects. They simply cannot raise the money.

Furthermore this is not a new project. This is simply a modification of an authorized project under which no requirement for land enhancement was to be taken into account. Nobody has argued, not even the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps of Engineers, that those people who would have benefitted by the original project, should be required to assume these additional burdens. In this bill we are simply revising a previous authorization in order to build a project which would be more useful to the Government, more useful to the country, and more useful to the area. If downstream property owners are not charged for flood control benefits why should those people upstream be compelled to pay for land accretion values from flood control projects whose principal purpose is to protect the Federal investment in exist-



ing flood control works along Red River? This project is of primary benefit to the main stem of the Red River but none of those enjoying this primary benefit under the plan submitted by the administration would be required to pay for land enhancement and none of them should be. We in the upstream areas would be placed in the untenable position of having to pay costs not charged against others in the same project and costs which have not been charged in the great bulk of similar projects constructed throughout the United States to which Oklahoma taxpayers have contributed. We called on the Army Engineers for a list of projects constructed on this basis and they gave us the name of only one. With no more precedent than this the Bureau of the Budget is insisting upon provisions which would have the effect of killing this project. Yet the project is among the best in the bill. The Engineers have testified repeatedly to the need for it, to its desirability and to its basic soundness. The people who live in this section of the country should be treated as other citizens have been treated ever since this program began. This project is a needed one. General Itschner testified that it was an exceptionally good one. I urge that you defeat the pending amendment and pass the bill as reported by the Committee on Public Works.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did the gentleman from Oklahoma ever hear of taxes foregone up until this project was considered by the committee?

Mr. ALBERT. I not only never heard of it but I asked the Corps of Engineers to give me a list of projects on which it has been used, and I am still waiting for that list. I have been told that some were under construction, but I have never heard of one that has already been built.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There has never been a method of making cost allocations that brought into play any tax-forgone theory.

Mr. ALBERT. The whole Tennessee Valley, the great Columbia River Valley, and all the great projects built by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation containing power all over the country were built, I have been told, without the taxes-forgone theory.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I join my colleague from the Third District in urging that this project be approved and that this amendment be defeated. We looked at this area during the disastrous floods of last summer. There is no area of the country that needs such a multipurpose project more.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague, who is thoroughly familiar with the project.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I join the gentleman from Oklahoma, members of this great committee and other Members of the House in opposing this amendment.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma has so well stated, Millwood Dam and Reservoir is one of the central projects so necessary to the comprehensive flood-control program for the Red River Basin.

This project has been recognized by the Corps of Engineers, the Red River Valley Association, and everyone who has been interested in adequate protection throughout this great valley as essential and necessary, if we are going to have an adequate program of flood control and other benefits so vital to the millions of people affected throughout the Red River Basin.

Millwood Dam and Reservoir was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1946. We have experienced controversies within the area which have made it most difficult to bring about the construction of this project.

We have endeavored for years to resolve these differences. Because the central project that would provide 75 percent of the protection so vital to the overall program is in my District, I have personally assumed the responsibility of bringing about a settlement or a compromise which would be as acceptable as possible to the greatest number affected.

Through the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers, the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas, we have proposed a plan which this committee has accepted that will finally bring to a full fruition a project that would mean so much to both Arkansas and Oklahoma as well as to those who dwell in the entire valley.

The amendment proposed here would seriously interfere with and virtually kill this project. If adopted, it would further continue to endanger the lives and property of the people in this great valley with the threat of devastating floods. I, therefore, implore my colleagues to strike down this attempt to destroy the faithful and honest efforts made by so many to such a necessary and worthy project.

Furthermore, I wish to call to the attention of the Committee the fact that only a few moments ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] offered an amendment to a project in his District which included the very same provision that the gentleman now would strike from these projects by his amendment.

The committee overwhelmingly adopted Mr. TEAGUE'S amendment and it is included in this bill. To adopt this amendment then would be a departure from the same principle which this committee has approved in the other project. No area is in greater need of a program to stimulate the economy in the interest of the public than does this area throughout the Little River Basin, which is affected by this program.

I want to express my appreciation to the committee for its vision and interest in the economy throughout the Nation and my appreciation for its support of this most worthy program of Millwood and other projects in the Little River Basin. I want to compliment the

gentleman from Oklahoma for his untiring efforts and his cooperation with me and the constituency that I represent in helping to bring about a project so vital and so necessary.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Has there ever before been considered this entirely hypothetical theory of taxes—foregone from something that might be put there if something else existed, if something else happened?

Mr. ALBERT. Not that I know of.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Oklahoma has given a very learned and clear explanation of this project and the effect of the amendment on the project. I join with him in vigorous opposition to the amendment.

This project is not within my Congressional District; it is not within the State of Louisiana; it is a most worthy and most important project—one of the most important projects in this bill when considered in relation to the effect upon vast numbers of people residing in a great area of the Southwest.

The Millwood Dam and Reservoir project was approved by the Army Engineers after long studies. It came to Congress and was approved by the Congress in the Interim Red River Flood Control Act which was signed by the President and is now the law. It is true that the Millwood Dam and Reservoir project has been the basis of some discussions and that a rearrangement has been made of some of the plans of the Army Engineers. The project, however, has the same general purpose, bearing the approval of the Engineers and Congress. The modifications made in no way affect the validity of the project, its importance to a great mass of people in the Southwest, and the need of action at this time.

In putting through the Millwood Dam and Reservoir project as presently planned, the Engineers will be able to go forward with their program of flood control for the Red River Valley. This river is over 1,200 miles in length and flows through the Southwest, finally into the Mississippi and Old River in Louisiana. We in the lower valley, of course, are interested in all projects affecting flood control, navigation, and development of these river systems and the use of the water which is channeled in them by those who live within the watershed.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is voted down and that the committee stipulations regarding the new Millwood Dam and Reservoir plans on the Red River in Oklahoma are fully approved by this House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. The Engineers testified that the overall benefit-cost ratio is 1.47 to 1. I recommend that the committee bill be retained in its present form.

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

Mr. Chairman, the second part of this amendment refers to page 34 of the bill, known as the Lone Rock and Gilbert project on the Buffalo River, a tributary of the White River. I want to agree with what my colleagues have said here about Circular A-47.

On May 6, 1952, General Chorpene transmitted to me a letter of General Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers, and a letter from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Corps of Engineers, stating that these projects were feasible and should be authorized, but we did not have an omnibus bill. Before we got to that omnibus bill this circular A-47 came along, which makes difficult every project in the United States if it is followed to the letter. These projects are feasible under the same formula under which other projects on the White River and its tributaries were authorized, I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in years gone by, I have heard some very severe criticisms of the policies of the Truman administration. But, I just want to say here today that I have never heard as much criticism of the policy of the Truman administration as I have heard this criticism of the directive A-47 of the Budget Bureau. Directive A-47 was a product of the Truman administration. It was issued in 1952 by the Truman Director of the Budget. It was issued by the Truman Director of the Budget after an investigation covering 4 years and 378 hours of hearings and meetings by a commission, an interdepartmental commission 4 of whom were Truman appointees—a representative of the Secretary of the Interior, a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, a representative of the Secretary of Commerce, a representative of the Federal Power Commission, and in the fifth case of the Army Engineers who are, of course, non-political. We have heard a great deal of criticism about the Truman policy as enunciated in the Truman directive A-47.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to correct a couple of impressions which have probably been left erroneously, of course, not intentionally. But, in regard to this recommendation as it relates to the incremental method, there are two methods involved here—the incremental method and the separable-cost-remaining-benefits method. The Army Engineers recommended the latter. Why did they recommend the latter? The gentleman from Oklahoma says the TVA should be used as an example with regard to what has been done and justifying his position on taxes, forgone. On page 3805 of the Record, it is stated that the method of separable-cost-remaining-benefits is essentially a refinement of the one developed in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Thus this same project justifies my position in opposition to the use of the incremental method. This incremental method, as compared to the separable-cost-remain-

ing-benefits method, was the result of a recommendation of none other than the Hoover Commission task force studying this question. You gentlemen on the majority side and many on the minority side supported, as well as myself, the bill, H. R. 8002, on the question of saving money, the Hoover Commission recommendation. Here is another one. You have an opportunity to support economy and the Hoover Commission further if you support the amendment I introduced.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, this not only resulted in that but also from a very careful study of the Department of the Interior and all the agencies involved in this particular question. I submit again that this is the wrong place, so far as I am concerned, to try on a hit-and-miss basis to make changes from the directive A-47 which our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], stated resulted from the recommendation of the Jones subcommittee that studied this very question and in that subcommittee stated that, when it came to the question of where costs should be allocated, they be on a basis equal to the different purposes to be served in the project involved. That is exactly what the formula does in my amendment and which the Army Engineers recommended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: Page 48, beginning with line 16, strike out all of section 205, ending line 23, page 49, and substitute in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 205. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of

Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.

"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further*, That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water sup-



ply or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water-supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act."

Mr. BALDWIN (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read.

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

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to section 205 as it appeared in the Mack substitute bill with the addition of the amendment adopted on the floor stating that the provisions of this section shall not be construed to modify the provisions of section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The gentleman from California knows full well my very high personal regard for him. May I ask him this question: Is not this the same language that has been debated over and over and which was defeated earlier in the afternoon?

Mr. BALDWIN. This is the language which appeared in the Mack substitute as amended on the floor. We have not however had a separate vote on this particular section. There was a vote on the entire Mack substitute.

Mr. Chairman, if I may go on to explain the provisions of the proposed amendment, serious objection has been raised in particular by the reclamation States of the West to subsection (b) of section 205 as it appears in the committee bill on the ground that the low-flow provision may conflict with the rights of irrigation users in some of the Western States, and because of the vagueness of the wording of subsection (b) of section 205. This amendment would strike that section and give further opportunity to work out a very specific provision covering such cases.

As to subsection (c) of section 205, it refers to domestic water supply. Subsection (c) as in the committee bill, gives the Corps of Engineers very broad authority to go ahead and make estimates for some future time, uncertain at the present time, but some future time for domestic water supply without having any specific contract in mind. This amendment would tie that down, would require a specific agreement with the State or locality by the time the project was completed. So that is tied down by more specific language and, therefore, the Corps of Engineers would have some guidelines to follow.

May I say again as I said yesterday that a provision identical to this except for the amendment adopted in the House today was adopted by the other body 2 years ago in the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill. So this

amendment has already received the approval of the other body in a similar bill 2 years ago.

This amendment also meets with the concurrence of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, both agencies; and it is offered only in an endeavor to resolve some difficult water problems particularly of the Western States.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is not maintaining, is he, that the Corps of Engineers prefers his language to the language of the Blatnik amendment?

Mr. BALDWIN. The Corps of Engineers recommended this language 2 years ago at the time the other body adopted these provisions in the omnibus bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But the gentleman has no statement from the Engineers that they prefer his language to that in the Blatnik amendment as amended thus far?

Mr. BALDWIN. I have not asked them for a preference; I asked if they concurred in this and they stated that they did.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish at this time to say that if this amendment is defeated I intend to offer what might be said to be the middle of the road amendment on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments that I desire to offer, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc. They affect the same region, the Hidden Reservoir and the Buchanan Reservoir in California. They propose to accomplish the same purpose in the same area.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 44, strike out lines 17 to 24; on page 44, strike out lines 9 to 16.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, these two reservoirs were first surveyed by the Army Engineers in 1945. In 1949 they came before the Congress with a favorable recommendation by the United States Army Engineers. President Truman, his Budget Bureau and his Secretary of the Army wrote letters to the Congress protesting these two reservoirs on the basis that the Army Engineers' surveys did not supply sufficient data to show that these projects were economically justified. They were not approved in 1949.

In 1956, President Eisenhower's Secretary of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget protested these projects and asked that the survey data be brought up to date. The projects were again submitted in 1957, last year, by the Army

Engineers with the data not having been brought up to date.

That is the basis for asking that these amendments be accepted. The data, as of now, is not sufficient to pass on their economic justification.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on January 3, 1957, I introduced in the House of Representatives bills providing for a more comprehensive development and utilization of natural-water resources in plans and construction of reservoir projects with these two bills being H. R. 350 and H. R. 847. My primary concern is the enactment of legislation providing for low-flow regulation. Enactment of this particular legislation is of great importance to my home State of Kentucky and to our section of the United States. In Kentucky we have in the process of construction and in the planning stage, reservoirs which will halt flood damages occurring annually, preventing the loss of lives, millions of dollars in damage to property, and conserving millions of tons of topsoil which is annually washed away. I have urged enactment of the low-flow provision of this particular bill before the committees of both bodies.

The necessity of low-flow regulation is obvious because we look to our rivers more and more for service. Our expanding population has brought about new uses and greater demands for water. It is to the best interests of our people and national security that legislation be enacted to increase low stream flows.

With an adequate flow, navigation stages are more economically maintained, the recreational values of the streams and rivers are expanded, and measures to abate pollution are simpler and more effective. By far the most important justification of low-flow legislation is the ability rendered to control the water temperature which has an important effect on recreational and industrial use and on bacterial pollution.

The daily use of water, industrial and private, amounts to approximately 200 billion gallons. The population of the United States consists of some 165 million people, and the average daily consumption of water is 150 gallons per capita or 17 billion gallons collectively. Actually, the rainfall would provide an adequate supply in most sections of our country if the ground acted as a reservoir. Erosion has made water supply a serious problem, and drastic steps must be taken now to conserve any excess rainfall. By conservative estimate, it is now agreed that the population of our country will be some 207 million people in 1975. In 20 years the public water supply will be expected to furnish 30 billion gallons daily.

Low-cost water transportation is important in peacetime and in wartime. Additional reservoir storage will permit greater flexibility of operations during summer droughts and will serve the orderly progressive expansion of industrialization. Low-cost transportation on water will enable products to move from the mines, forests, and farms to the consumers over a widespread area.

The change in our way of life is responsible for the increased need for recreational facilities. Our yearly vacation with pay and retirement with benefits have enhanced the recreational value of water. Low stream flows play an important role in the conservation of fish and wildlife through the regulation of the water level and abatement of pollution.

The abatement of pollution is beneficial to more than wildlife. The fact that water would no longer stagnate due to the regulation of low stream flows would be of great importance to the solution of certain health and sanitation problems which are presently of great concern.

The control of water temperature through the regulation of low flows is of the utmost importance to industry. Many rural areas have been industrialized for this very reason and the standard of living has been raised. The type of industrialization depends to a great extent on the natural resources found in the vicinity.

Reservoirs built to accomplish low-flow regulation will be large enough to contain all of the rainfall in flood season and they will prevent damage brought about as the result of unchecked floods.

The Corps of Engineers must be given the opportunity to incorporate storage for low-flow augmentation in order to provide for the best development of the Nation's water resources. Enactment of S. 497 will mean that our future reservoir projects will be planned, authorized, and constructed in such a manner as to control and increase low stream flows.

If you will investigate, you will find that the ICA and its predecessor agencies have constructed 197 navigation, flood-control, irrigation, and reclamation projects in 46 countries at a total cost of \$355,800,000. During the first 9 months of 1957, the ICA has obligated \$63,500,000 for such projects. This figure includes \$21,281,000 for 35 new starts in 22 countries. These countries include Cambodia, China, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Egypt, Greece, India, Iran, Lebanon, Turkey, Ethiopia, Libya, United Kingdom, Chile, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Peru, British Guiana, and Yugoslavia.

The budget proposals submitted to Congress for fiscal year 1959 contain no money for new surveys, advance engineering and design, or construction starts anywhere in the United States. This action, of course, is not to the best interest of our water-resources development program and on February 27, 1958, the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] directed a letter to Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, in which he stated as follows:

A review of the 1959 budget estimate for civil functions indicates that the program is completely inadequate, particularly in light of the current economic situation. No new construction starts are proposed and the rate of progress reflected in the budget on going projects is being slowed to the point where it is likely that the program will cost the taxpayers much more money than is necessary.

The hearings on the Public Works Appropriation bill have therefore been postponed pending submission by you directly to this committee, a more realistic program and revised estimates.

If we can afford to build navigation, flood control, irrigation, and reclamation projects abroad, we can afford every project provided for under S. 497, and this especially applies to the benefits to be derived from section 205 of the bill which provides for low flow regulation.

Mr. Chairman, S. 497 should be enacted, and I sincerely hope that every Member of the House votes for passage of this important legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the restriction used by the Corps of Engineers on water resources developed in the construction of these reservoirs for an additional water supply would be so limited there would not be a great opportunity to have reservoir capacity over and above that now provided by law. I believe the language contained in the Blatnik amendment will serve the purpose and the objective of regulating low flow and will provide greater facilities in these reservoirs for later use, both by industry and by municipalities in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Hidden and Buchanan Reservoirs involved in the objections of the Bureau of the Budget stemmed from a long controversy that existed many years ago between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers as to who would carry on some water projects in California. It goes back to the days when Secretary Ickes was feuding with the Corps of Engineers. The reports came in and the Engineers agreed to those projects. I think if we follow the proposals of the minority to strike these particular items from this bill, they will be adopting a policy that they all opposed a few years ago. These dams are necessary to the future development of the combined water projects in California. I hope the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. Has it been unanimously agreed that these two amendments will be considered en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have one last amendment to submit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: Page 28, line 14, change period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That the works at Rome, N. Y., shall not be constructed until a report showing economic justification has been completed by the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the Blatnik amendment proposes three flood control projects in the Mohawk Valley of New York. One of those projects will cost \$1.5 million. It has a very favorable cost-benefit ratio, We on this side approve of that project.

The second project has a cost-benefit ratio that is very satisfactory. It will cost \$500,000. We approve of those two projects.

The Rome, N. Y., project is a project which will cost the Government only \$240,000. It does not have a favorable cost-benefit ratio. So, on this side we are proposing an amendment which says that the Army Engineers shall not construct this project until such time as it is shown that it has a dollar benefit for dollar cost ratio. This is the parity formula that is applied to most projects in river and harbor bills. This is the only issue involved.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as it goes from here to conference with the other body will involve 18 projects which are not entirely acceptable to the administrative branch. It is our understanding that there are 31 such unacceptable projects in the Senate bill. We hope that the majority members of this committee will seek an early conference with the Senate to the end that the differences in the two bills may be ironed out soon and a bill sent to the President of the United States. If the bill is then vetoed, it will come back here in time for the Congress to act on that veto prior to adjournment. We hope the situation on this river and harbor bill will not be like that on the postal pay bill. We do not want the bill to reach the President so late that if a veto comes there will be no opportunity on the part of the House and the Senate to pass their judgment on the President's veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 48, beginning with line 25, strike out all through line 21 on page 49 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In prosecuting plans and projects for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes heretofore or hereafter authorized, storage may be included in any reservoir project to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers without reimbursement to increase low flows downstream to the extent warranted at that time, or anticipated to be warranted at that time, or anticipated to be warranted during the economic life of the project, by widespread, general, and non-exclusive benefits from such increases in low flow. Storage may likewise be included for the same purpose and under the same conditions in any reservoir constructed by the Secretary of the Interior for irrigation, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supply, and allied purposes, under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.) Storage authorized by this section shall be constructed and used in compliance with applicable State laws and interstate compacts with respect to water rights. *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to amend, modify, or limit the appli-



capability of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902.

"(c) In carrying out this policy, it is hereby provided that storage may also be included in any reservoir project surveyed, planned, constructed or to be planned, surveyed and/or constructed by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation to impound water for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water and the reasonable value thereof may be taken into account in estimating the economic value of the entire project: *Provided*, That when the contract for the use of such impounded waters is made it shall be on the basis that will provide equitable reimbursement to the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior as the case may be: *Provided further*, That the cost of providing storage for such future demand shall not be more than 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project, and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of such storage for future demand will begin not more than 10 years after the date when the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose, except that (1) no payment need be made with respect to storage for future water supply until such supply is first used, (2) with respect to repayment of cost allocated to such future water supply such 50 years shall not commence until such supply is first used, and (3) no interest shall be charged on such cost until such supply is first used, but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed 10 years. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection insofar as they relate to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior shall be alternative to and not a substitute for the provisions of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) relating to the same subject."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the middle of the road amendment to which I made reference just a few minutes ago. All legislation is more or less a matter of compromise. This is a compromise between what I suggested yesterday on the floor of the House and the amendment which I placed in the RECORD following my presentation, and what the committee itself is desirous of accomplishing in its presentation this afternoon.

May I simply state this, with all due deference to my fine and able friend from Alabama [Mr. JONES] I do not personally believe that the inclusion of the Baldwin amendment to the Mack substitute and the same amendment to the Blatnik amendment does what the gentleman from Alabama seems to think it does, and that is, decides this matter on a parity as far as reclamation and flood control in the Western States are con-

cerned. If that were right, then there would not be any necessity of my making this presentation. But inasmuch as what we are trying to arrive at is equal treatment of all Federal water resource development activities throughout the United States, then it would seem to me that in those 17 Western States which have water rights, recognized as legal rights under State law, and which are at the present time honored under reclamation law, as well as under the flood-control acts, they should be so honored in this legislation which has some new benefits which have not heretofore been given to water resource development programs.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my good friend and distinguished chairman of the Irrigation Subcommittee if he believes the effect of his language which he now seeks to have this committee adopt, would be to require the Army Engineers to follow the same rules with regard to water rights in the 17 Western States that the Bureau of Reclamation has followed?

Mr. ASPINALL. As far as they have been followed up to the present time under the flood-control acts that are in operation. In other words, it is my feeling that with this amendment we make no difference between the relationship of the flood-control projects and the reclamation projects, whether they be single or multiple.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman not feel that this places a burden or a requirement upon the Army Engineers in the 17 Western States which they do not now have?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not feel that it goes that far, nor that it would embarrass them any more than they are embarrassed at the present time in such situations as the Fallbrook case, with which my friend is acquainted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is it not true that the original Flood Control Act of 1944 sets out the responsibility of the Army Engineers as well as the Bureau of Reclamation to comply with the water laws of the States west of the 98th meridian?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct, as I understand it. And if it were not for the fact that we are giving additional benefits in the legislation now before us, to water-resource development, then I would not have offered this amendment. But because of these additional benefits I think they should be applicable to both of these agencies which have water-resource development activities under their jurisdiction.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's amendment does not in any manner change the law that has been in force and effect for a number of years. It is only a reiteration of it to make certain that the Army

Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation respect the State water rights.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct in his assumption so far as the reclamation States are concerned.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Does the gentleman's amendment apply only to the 17 Western States?

Mr. ASPINALL. Inasmuch as the 17 Western States are those States which have water rights as such established by statutory and case law, yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, will it require the Army Engineers to comply with State law in the States east of the 98th meridian?

Mr. ASPINALL. If that were the determination, when this bill gets to conference, I would be requesting the conferees to make such change in this language so that it would not do as my friend fears.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who is on his feet.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I desired to ask the same question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. With reference to the conference which the gentleman mentioned, with all due respect to the gentleman from Colorado, may I suggest that he will not be a conferee.

Mr. ASPINALL. I understand that, but most certainly the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be interested in seeing to it that we arrive at an equitable decision in our final consideration of the problem.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman's position, but I should like some information as to how this would affect projects such as we have had before the committee, how it would affect the basic purpose of the Engineers to provide flood control—in other words, whether they would be barred from that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and urge my colleagues to support his amendment.

I am greatly concerned that section 285 as it is now written constitutes a threat to western water rights.

Water law in the arid and semiarid West differs in many ways from English common law and from water law in the humid regions of our country.

In the irrigated areas of the West there is nothing more valuable to an irrigation farmer than his water rights. The entire economy of the irrigated West is dependent upon water rights which have been acquired under State water laws. The validity of these water rights and the integrity of Western

States water laws should be upheld by passage of the Aspinall amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Colorado if he will respond to a question or two regarding this. There is a pretty serious concern on the part of some people who have examined the language which the gentleman has just presented to the House as to the possibility that it might involve imposition of some additional restriction or some slowdown on activities of the Army Engineers not only west of the 98th meridian but east of it as well. I just wanted the gentleman to know that there is very great reluctance on the part of this member of the committee to go along with that language if it does place that kind of restriction on the Army Engineers.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is not my intention to slow down or embarrass any activity of the Corps of Army Engineers. Section (c) as the amendment proposes has placed a limitation, there is no question about that, but this bill goes out ahead of any legislation that we have up to the present time. I think that the limitation of 10 years is a satisfactory limitation for interest-free money to be used in the construction of any facilities of a project which is to be used for municipal, domestic, or industrial purposes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe I understood the gentleman to say there is not any intent on his part to restrict or embarrass the Bureau of Reclamation; or did the gentleman say it is not his intention to do that with regard to the Army Engineers?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. After all, this is a Corps of Army Engineers' bill, and that is what I meant to say. I state it right now. It is applicable to the Army Engineers' program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the event the gentleman's language should be adopted, and I have some very grave reservations personally as to the effect of it on the Engineers' programs, I hope the gentleman will understand it will be subject to considerable discussion in conference.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado understands that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASPINALL) there were—ayes 46, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, may we have some indication from the other side of the aisle as to what time we can expect to terminate this debate?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Up to now no one has had an opportunity even to offer an amendment, except members of the committee. After all, there are 435 Members of the House. Up to now no one except members of the committee has had a chance to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. We do not have that complaint on our side. There has been considerable repetition of amendments.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman would care to designate a

time for closing debate on all amendments to the bill, say about 4:30?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the membership of the House besides the members of the committee should have some opportunity to offer amendments and speak on them, if they so desire. That opportunity has not been given to them as yet.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, can we agree on limiting debate to 4:30 p. m.?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree on that limitation of time. Here is a gentleman who has been trying all afternoon to speak for 5 minutes and he has not been able to do so yet.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am just trying to see if it is not possible to give us some assurance that there will not be a continuation of this repetition of speeches on matters that have already been previously considered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order and I believe we are proceeding in the regular order to transact business as usual.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to propound a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEWES: On page 57, immediately after line 22, insert the following:

"Sec. 211. For the purpose of disapproval by the President, each paragraph of each of the preceding sections, shall be considered a bill within the meaning of article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States, and each such paragraph which is disapproved shall not become law unless repassed in accordance with the provisions of section 7, article I, of the Constitution relating to the repassage of a bill disapproved by the President."

And renumber the following section accordingly.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that such language is entirely out of order on any type of legislation. We do not have a provision in our Constitution for an item veto.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that constitutional provisions are involved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair does not pass upon constitutional questions. The amendment seems to be pertinent to the bill and relates to the bill. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TEWES. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Tewes] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated by the point of order, the import of my amendment is clear. It would authorize the President to veto this measure item by item. This obviously strikes at the heart of the discussion that has been swirling around us here for the last 2 days and which resulted a short time ago in our eminent Speaker expressing his viewpoints on

the powers of the Congress as against those of the President. I think, however, that everyone here is well conscious of the fact, on the basis of debate that we have had to this point, that there are unique and distinctive pressures exerted on the Members of Congress in legislation of this sort. Certainly no harm can come from making it possible for the President of the United States to examine these projects item by item. Furthermore, if my amendment should be enacted and the President should exercise a partial veto, Congress will still have the opportunity to override the veto. I want to say that while I am well aware of the rights and prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government, I believe the public would like to see the President have the opportunity I have suggested. On numerous occasions I have said publicly that I favor the item veto provision for the President, and I have received nothing but unanimous acceptance of that proposal.

Before I conclude I may just as well meet now one of the inquiries which will inevitably be made. Someone will possibly suggest that I am but a bystander and having no interest in the legislation, can make this proposal easily. There is in this measure a paragraph providing \$300,000 for a project which is important to my District and to the people of Wisconsin. Nonetheless, I believe that my project along with the rest of the projects contained in this bill should be subject to the critical examination in the interest of the entire Nation which the President can give it. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. TEWES. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wish to strongly endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES]. Those who believe that a public works bill should be passed can insure enactment by adopting this amendment. The item veto is a recommendation of the Hoover Commission. It would permit the President to eliminate those pork-barrel projects which make this a bad bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with full respect for the intent and the merits of the amendment, I say this for the consideration of the Committee: It is obvious to all Members that this innovation is something completely new. It is a matter which would require nothing but the most careful scrutiny and study after thorough hearings by a committee. I urge that the amendment be rejected and that the gentleman draw up proper legislation which will be referred to the committee for whatever proper procedure may be required.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as earlier today I spoke against a Texas project, lest I be misunderstood by those



who, whether they intend to or not, do misunderstand, I want to make something perfectly plain. I am opposed to projects that are hastily conceived, wasteful or politically contrived to evade accepted Congressional procedures.

I recognize as a former member of this committee, that there are something like \$8 billion worth of projects backlogged, some 20 years' supply at the current going rate of appropriation, and that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. So I even wonder at times if we are serious in these deliberations, in view of the world situation today.

It was not so long ago that the Russians put up the sputnik, and Americans agreed that, "We are going to tighten our belts, roll up our sleeves," and build an even stronger defense. The President in his state of the Union message asked Congress to provide the necessary money because the American people are willing to take up the slack in some of the other projects. Then I remember only last year our concern over the big budget. Members on both sides said we must effect economies. Today I say some of these projects can be eliminated, some can be trimmed, and new ones could be postponed. The Texas project, the La Quinta Channel, as the minority report states on page 72 sets a bad precedent and is not entirely warranted according to these facts. Many of these other projects could be delayed, even the best projects, while we put additional money into the satellite program, into missiles, and new defense measures to preserve the United States as the world leader.

I just came back from Cape Canaveral where I had the privilege of seeing some of these missiles, and I know it is taking hundreds of millions of additional dollars that we have not planned in the budget. You and I know that expenditures beyond income means deficit financing. That means not a tax cut but the sorriest tax increase of all, that of inflation, destroying the value of our money, and hurting those who have saved a few dollars. It is too costly a tax. I believe at this time we should cut Government expenditures thus permitting a tax cut without cheapening the dollar. This is the way to help our people. I believe the President will use the item veto with discretion and eliminate those projects which have not qualified according to Congress own agreed upon procedures of securing reports from Engineers, Budget and Interior.

Our world situation today demands frugality and self-discipline on our part if we are to provide the greatly increased military sums. We cannot blindly spend more in every program. A strong economy is a strong defense, and vice versa. A currency declining in value through inflation is the road to ruin—and loss of freedom. We should consider first a balanced budget and then within this framework, select the most worthy public works. Further, we should follow the public works procedures now embodied in the law or change the procedures by law.

I want to commend the able gentleman from Wisconsin for his introduc-

ing the item veto. The duly approved projects should not lose out, as they most surely would under a blanket veto. I urge the approval of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEWES) there were—ayes 69, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 37, line 2, change the period to a colon and add the following proviso: "Provided, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute in cash or equivalent work a percentage of the cost of Carlyle Reservoir and Levee Districts 3, 4, 8, 10 and 13, calculated on the same basis as cost sharing for the other projects recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment applies to the Shelbyville project on the Kaskaskia River in Illinois.

I point out that the Shelbyville project was one of the projects to which the minority objected because there was not enough information available as to the costs which the local interests were to pay. Since the minority acted in this matter that information has been obtained and its objections have been withdrawn to this particular project except that my amendment has been suggested. It has been suggested by the minority, it has been suggested by the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. It is an amendment in which I feel everyone should concur in.

Briefly, it is this: The Shelbyville project is in the committee bill. It will be built in cooperation with the Carlyle project, a dam and reservoir that was authorized 20 years ago.

Twenty years ago there was little or no sharing of costs by local communities. Since the proposed Shelbyville project requires such participation on the basis of present formulas and present policies, the Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget recommend that all of the local communities served by both the Shelbyville Dam and the Carlyle Dam pay on an equal basis and on the same formula. That is the only purpose of this amendment. I think it should be adopted. The gentleman who represents the Shelbyville District, I understand, objects to it but it does not affect him.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, inasmuch as he referred to me?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Is it not true that the Shelbyville project has been included and that the gentleman's amendment does not affect this Shelbyville project in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. SCHERER. That is right; it does not affect the gentleman's project in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. The Shelbyville project has always been in. What the gentleman's amendment will do is to try to collect more cost benefits in the Carlyle area?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, because these two projects now have been united by the Army Engineers and will be developed and be built at approximately the same time. If my amendment is not adopted your people will pay a great deal more—your local communities will pay a great deal more, than the people who are served in the Carlyle area for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. What the gentleman is trying to do is to charge the people in the Carlyle area about \$7 million more to get their project built in that area?

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is a project that was authorized in 1938 like any other project?

Mr. SCHERER. But it has not been built.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I cannot understand why you should be trying to get in an amendment of this nature that would charge the people in that particular area so much more money.

Mr. SCHERER. Your people that you represent in that area would certainly object if the people in the next district were not required to pay as much as your people for local benefits. I have no personal interest in this. The Army Engineers suggested the amendment and to me it seems sound, fair, and equitable and I submit it for the Committee's consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNE of Illinois to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 29, line 17, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with the Hendry County, Fla., project and provides that local interests share in the cost of the project according to the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. The majority of the committee has modified the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers on this project by reducing the amount of local cooperation by an undetermined amount. The estimated cost figure is \$3,172,000 as contained in the bill. Under these circumstances the minority concurs in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chief of Engineers and is opposed to inclusion of this item in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am new to the legislative end of our Government, but I have had considerable experience in the courts. In the courts, and I assume in the legislative body, we give consideration to expert testimony. I refer to that dedicated group called the Corps of Engineers. I also include the Bureau of

the Budget. We heard nothing to contradict the testimony of those experts and I respectfully suggest that they be given consideration.

At this stage it seems to me that we are in the eighth inning of a ball game and it is about time we get a base hit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 38, line 15, change the period at the end of the line to a colon and add the following proviso: "Provided, That with respect to any power attributable to any dam in such plan to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, an equitable proportion of such power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I think maybe this is an amendment that the committee might want to listen to, because it was included in the Senate bill on two occasions.

It involves the allocation of power that will be generated by the Big Bend Dam when it is constructed. The Big Bend Dam is located in South Dakota. Under the basic law as it now is and has been administered, the power from that dam will be allocated chiefly and principally to preference customers. As I said, this dam is located in South Dakota. Now, it so happens in this particular instance that South Dakota has practically no preference customers. It adjoins the State of Nebraska, which is a public power State and which has all preference customers. So, the power generated by this dam, if we do not adopt this amendment which was in the bill in the Senate, will be allocated by the Secretary of the Interior to the preference customers in Nebraska. We will be using the natural resources of the State of South Dakota, and the evidence indicates that South Dakota, which needs this power and wants this power, will be allocated to the preference customers of the State of Nebraska.

Now, all this amendment does is to say that the Secretary of the Interior, who under the law has the right to allocate power in these instances, shall allocate or have the right to allocate a fair share of this power to the consumers in the State of South Dakota. As I say, when H. R. 12080 passed this House the last time and was sent to the Senate, the Senate added this amendment which I propose. The Senate in its report at that time said: "The committee considers it equitable that the State in which such power is generated should receive a fair share of the power so generated." When H. R. 12080 went to conference, the managers on the part of the House agreed to this amendment and the House subsequently approved that amendment in H. R. 12080 when it adopted the con-

ference report. Of course, as we all know, that bill was vetoed.

Now, this year, as the Senate bill comes to the House, that same amendment is included, and the Senate committee in its report says the same thing this year as it said last year. The majority of our committee, however, saw fit to strike this language from the bill that is now before you, and all I am trying to do is to put that language which the Senate included in both bills and which the House agreed to in conference last year back in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Are you not afraid that if we put that language in the bill the President might veto it?

Mr. SCHERER. I know the gentleman is being facetious.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what motivates the unusual concern of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] about developments in South Dakota. But I do not believe his suggestion would solve the need for more electric power in my State.

What the gentleman is suggesting, in effect, is a repeal of the long-standing Federal power-preference clause under which river-basin developments such as our great Missouri River projects have been executed.

I am convinced that the surest way to kill the building of Big Bend Dam would be to follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio. It is doubtful if the appropriate committees of Congress or the administration would approve of this unusual procedure. If it were to pass the Congress, it could very easily jeopardize future appropriations for the entire Big Bend project.

This is the kind of far-reaching proposal that should be very carefully scrutinized to determine whether its practical results would benefit or hinder the expansion of power resources for the State of South Dakota.

Mr. PERKINS. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have supported S. 497 with the provision providing for inclusion of storage for low-flow augmentation in flood control and navigation projects. The Mack substitute does not contain the low-flow benefits as provided in S. 497. It is a matter of common knowledge that the low-flow benefits will relieve pollution, benefit fish and wildlife, contribute greatly to navigation, and provide more adequate water supplies for both domestic and industrial uses. We also know that industrial development has been retarded in many areas where it could have been prevented if the Congress had heretofore enacted low-flow legislation. The benefits of such low-flow legislation are so general and widespread that they cannot justifiably be charged to any particular locality or group. The Congress has long since recognized that flood control

reservoirs which benefit wide areas downstream are properly provided as a Federal function without reimbursement. We know that water supply is becoming a national problem. Low-flow storage in major river systems is increasingly required to relieve developing water shortage.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the committee is very much opposed to this amendment. In all seriousness, we have been waiting a couple of hours to hear a good friend of ours, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], who served with us on the committee many, many years ago. We would like to have a vote, and we ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of Indiana to the amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK:

Page 42, line 22, after the first comma insert "except that the entire cost be borne by the Federal Government."

Page 42, line 23, after "of" strike out "\$4,359,000" and insert "\$9,500,000."

Page 42, after line 23, add a new paragraph.

"The State of Indiana shall donate free and without charge all State owned lands within the reservoir area."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Committee for taking this time at this late hour. I know the Members have grown weary.

However, I have had a combined total of 18 years of experience and served 6 years on the Flood Control Committee and 2 years as chairman of that subcommittee. And now I would like to offer an amendment to this bill and be heard on it.

I am not rehashing something that has been gone over. This is entirely new material. Every time a bill of this nature, a public-works bill or flood-control bill or rivers and harbors bill comes to this House, I look up and read the plaque on the wall above the Speaker's chair, a quotation from Daniel Webster about building up the great resources of this country. I think it would do all of us good to read that plaque and think in terms of what we can do to build up the resources of our own country.

The project I am suggesting is one with a high ratio of benefit to cost, almost 3 to 1. It involves only about \$9,500,000.

I want to say to the Committee that in my experience here, this is the first time I have ever come before this body and asked for funds for a project of this nature. I can look over the House and



see many Members who were here when I was chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, whose projects I incorporated in our bills; the great Buffalo Bay project at Houston, Tex., for instance. I remember the author of the bill, Bill Morrell, and Mr. DAVIS and some of the other gentlemen who were on the subcommittee at that time. I know my good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] had some projects. I can remember projects in Iowa, projects in Pennsylvania, and in Illinois. And in all that time I did not ask for one dime myself. Now I am asking for help on a project that has a ratio of benefit to cost of almost 3 to 1. It is highly desirable and it is made especially desirable at this time because we have 5 big defense projects that have either closed out during the past 6 months or are closing out. The Crane Ammunition Depot is going on a very limited basis. The Goodyear bag plant has closed. The Indiana Ordnance Works has closed. The Jefferson Quartermaster Depot, which has been in operation 100 years is now closed. The Jefferson Proving Grounds in my District is going on part time. In all, we have better than 10,000 employees affected by these developments.

This project would be of much help to us. It is a very meritorious project and I wish the committee would go along with me and help me to get it initiated.

It has been made more important recently by virtue of the Public Service Co. of the State of Indiana ceasing operations of one of their power dams which has provided water for the city of Bedford. Since they have ceased operations and turned that over to the city of Bedford it is doubtful that the city will be able to maintain the dam, maintain that source of water supply. The Monroe reservoir project would be a great source of water supply for the city of Bedford for future needs, as well as the city of Bloomington, which is the home of the University of Indiana. This project has a benefit of more than \$2 million a year. It is a \$9 million project, but the downstream benefit in the Ohio River, in the Mississippi River, in the Wabash River, and the downstream White River amounts to more than \$2 million a year.

I have been helping flood-control projects to protect the great Mississippi Basin and the Ohio Basin by levees and flood walls, but this is a real possibility of flood control because it is retention in upstream reservoirs and it is not flood diversion by directing floodwater into other areas.

I think we are going to get real flood prevention in the lower Mississippi once we adopt a lot of these smaller projects in the upper tributaries in the Mississippi and Ohio, where we can prevent those floods at their source and thereby make it less necessary to build flood walls to protect the dams downstream.

I hope this committee will adopt these three amendments that will make it possible for us to have this project once we get an appropriation, and thereby alleviate some of the unemployment and prevent some of the damage done by the

floods in the lower river valleys and the tributaries.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we ask that the amendment be rejected. It is obvious from the explanation that it is a rather involved matter, and I would hope that the committee would have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The reason I had not spoken to the committee about it before was that we had no notification of what was going to happen. We were going on the basis that the proving grounds were closing down the 1st day of June, and we did not know we were going to have limited employment. I would not want to come to the House and ask for a dollar unless we needed it. I would not ask for funds unless they were necessary, and this is a necessary project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Page 49, line 24, add a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of the Army shall, as to any project in which storage for beneficial consumptive use is provided pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section and which lies in any State wholly or partially west of the 98th meridian, impound water therein and release it therefrom (i) without interfering with any prior valid, subsisting vested right to the use of water, (ii) in accordance with the applicable laws of the State in which the storage is located relating to the appropriation of water for beneficial consumptive use, and (iii) in conformity with the applicable provisions of any interstate judicial decree or judgment or of any interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given."

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, it is now 4:30 p. m. May we have at this time an indication from the other side as to whether there are any further amendments coming from the other side?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that the committee knows of no other amendments although I am not sure that there are no other amendments. I think it would be in order if the gentleman who is in charge of the bill would ask either by unanimous consent or move to close debate so that we may vote on this tonight.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman whose amendment is now pending before the Committee that all debate on the committee amendment,

and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion this afternoon about this bill and whether or not we should give similar benefits to reclamation projects. This amendment does not go to that in any way, shape, or form. There is nothing here to give any better conditions to reclamation projects than are in the present law. I have tried to reduce this to a simple proposition. I cannot see that there should be any objection to it on the part of anyone. Historically, the Corps of Engineers projects have been for flood control and for navigation. Under this particular legislation in the section which my amendment would amend, there is added to those, that storage may be included for municipal or industrial water or for water for other beneficial community uses not only for the present but as they are anticipated in the future. In the West, we have somewhat different problems. Our problem is to store our water and use it and reuse it rather than so much to protect ourselves from floods and excesses of water. This would merely say within the 17 Western States involved that it would be up to the respective States to adjudicate the uses within that State that their own water will be put to; that is whether it should go for irrigational use or industrial use or domestic use or any other beneficial use. It would then provide that the Secretary of the Army must release that water only for the beneficial consumptive use in conformity with the State law. This is a States rights amendment. I do not see where it can do any harm to the bill. It protects the historic rights of these States to determine what uses the water within those States will be put and the priority of such use.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would the gentleman agree that this will impose a restriction upon the Army Engineer projects in the West that they do not have existing against them?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Only insofar as the Army Engineers might come along and try to take water from one consumptive use and put it to another without the consent of the people of the State. I have tried to limit it so that it applies only to the new purposes that are put in this bill for the Army projects, and that is for future beneficial consumptive use.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the Army Engineers have no storage for municipal or industrial purposes in the present reservoirs?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I think where they do have it now they have to comply with the State laws. This permits them to come in and not to store under an adjudicated right, under a contract, and so forth, but to store for the

needs that the Secretary of the Army anticipates in the future.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is right and I would be very sorry to see any restriction placed on the very successful operations in some States of the Union that does not apply to other States of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 there is that restriction now on the Army Engineers as well as a restriction on the Bureau of Reclamation. So you are not spelling out any new law, but just making it specific so they can read it and understand it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. That is what I am trying to say. I thank the gentleman. It only makes definite that it apply to these projects.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. We have already adopted an amendment which states very specifically that the provisions of section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be modified by this legislation.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. But, if the gentleman goes back to that act, you will find that that refers to projects authorized in that act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from Oklahoma says that we have now adopted section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 as an amendment to this bill. Does the gentleman interpret that to mean that the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are now bound under this bill to conform to the State water laws west of the 98th meridian as provided in sections 1 and 8.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I interpret that language which we adopted by the amendment a little while ago to mean that the situation shall continue in the future exactly as it is today with regard to section 1 and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. All this amendment would do would be to write it into the bill and remove the necessity of relying on any interpretation. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] has expired.

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

I would like to ask the committee in charge of this legislation if the amendment will materially affect the wording in the present Blatnik bill with regard to the question of charging local communities for benefits accruing from the construction of a flood control installation and trying to shoulder onto the people of that particular community some of the costs that would materialize on downstream, that are properly chargeable for the use of water to carry on navigation for instance in the Ohio Valley.

Let us clarify that particular point. I can see no objection to a water board or an industry entering into an agreement with the Army Engineers for the payment of storage facilities for water. But, when you ask a local community to assume responsibility for the cost of a facility, or any part of it, that is going to furnish benefit downstream, will the gentleman advise how this will affect that?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under existing law there can be contractual obligation made by a municipality with the Corps of Engineers to construct reservoir capacity and then release it to the municipality once the project is authorized by the Congress of the United States.

Section 205, as at the present moment, will give the Corps of Engineers the right to increase reservoir capacity, to increase downstream flow, and for future use for municipalities and for industry. That is the whole purpose of section 205.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I am against the amendment and for the language in the Blatnik bill.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am against recommitting this bill to the Public Works Committee and will vote for passage because I believe these projects are justified. One project in particular, the authorization for the construction of the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts, is vitally needed for the prosecution of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Connecticut River Basin. I filed legislation for this authorization, H. R. 94, substantially in accordance with the plan set forth in the New England-New York Interagency Committee report of March 15, 1955. My bill authorized the Chief of Engineers to make such changes as he deems necessary in view of the hurricane floods of 1955.

Mr. Speaker, those disastrous hurricane floods of August and October 1955 caused millions of dollars in damage in New England. We just cannot afford to allow such a catastrophe to occur again. The Littleville Reservoir project, included in this omnibus bill, will cost approximately \$5,430,000, and will afford great protection to the downstream communities of Westfield, West Springfield, and Agawam. The Westfield River empties into the Connecticut River at Agawam and West Springfield, across from the city of Springfield. The water from feeder tributaries, brooks and rivers can be impounded by the Littleville Reservoir and control the flow into the Westfield and Connecticut Rivers during flooding periods. I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Mack substitute would prevail and thus lessen the possibility of a Presidential veto. As you are aware, there were many questionable projects in the previous public-works bill and as a result, the construction of many meritorious projects was delayed.

I am particularly interested in completing the harbor project at Salem, Mass. Only last fall, I was aboard an oil tanker in that harbor that went aground due to inadequate depth in the channel. Salem is today enjoying a

renaissance in shipping but it has been curtailed by the delay in this project.

In the early days of American shipping by sailing vessels, Salem enjoyed a large foreign trade principally with East India, China, and South America. With the increasing size of ocean vessels after the advent of steam power, its comparatively shallow harbor failed to fulfill the requirements of shipping with the result that the foreign trade was entirely lost and the coastwise trade greatly reduced.

The domestic and industrial fuel requirements of a large hinterland area, which for over 100 years had been supplied through the wharves of Salem, had, by the beginning of this century, been forced to depend upon more distant ports for its supplies.

New England being wholly dependent upon imported fuels, and with the increasing demands for coal in the Salem area, the Salem navigation channel depths were subsequently increased in the 1920's to 22 feet and a few years later to 25 feet, while extensive harbor improvements were constructed in order to make high-grade southern bituminous coal available to this industrial region at reasonable prices. By 1929 some 80 deep-water vessels discharged over 455,000 tons of coal at Salem for distribution to that general area.

Just as Salem lost its shipping to deeper draft ports in the 19th century, so again in the 20th century, when the 5,000-ton colliers gave way to ships carrying 11,500 tons and oil in T-2 tankers displaced much of the domestic anthracite coal requirements, Salem Harbor shipping declined by 1950 to a mere 207,000 tons of coal, plus about 49,000 tons of oil.

During the Korean war, Salem Harbor entered upon a period of vast expansion resulting from the general rearming of this country, accompanied by a decentralization of industry spurred on by Federal encouragement. A large, modern oil terminal and distribution point was constructed at Salem Harbor, coal storage and handling facilities there were improved, and a modern steam-electric generating station was erected near the coal terminal, all of which were keyed to the prospective improvement of the navigation facilities to a depth of 32 feet or more, in contrast with the old 25-foot depth which had since shoaled to 24 feet.

With the general slowdown of Federal civil works during the Korean war, local interests were obliged to widen and deepen both the approach channel and berth facilities in order to provide for the emergency handling of T-2 tankers and 11,500-ton colliers which with their drafts of about 30 feet were able to navigate this channel only under the twice daily high tide conditions of short duration.

Meanwhile, the shipment of coal through Salem Harbor has since expanded over threefold from the 207,000 tons in 1950 to about 639,000 tons in 1956; while the oil shipments, which barely existed in 1950, actually reached 4,061,000 barrels—676,000 tons—in 1956 for a total fuel traffic of 1,315,000, or



more than 5 times the shipments of just 7 years ago. Careful estimates for 1959 show a still further increase in fuel shipments of about 30 percent, for a yearly total of over 1,700,000 tons.

Over one-half of the fuel now handled through Salem Harbor is widely distributed by truck and rail to domestic, commercial, and industrial users throughout a large portion of northeastern and north central Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire.

This phenomenal increase in shipment of fuels through Salem Harbor is of a very permanent nature as evidenced by the extensive onshore installations. To date the shipments have been handled by T-2 tankers and 11,500-ton colliers, but navigation hazards have mounted with this increased traffic by vessels that are oversized for the channel conditions, but undersized for the tonnages involved. As shown by the Division Engineer's Survey Report, the time delays while these ships are awaiting high tide conditions have become so large that they readily justify the cost of increasing the channel depth to 32 feet. Furthermore, the T-2 tankers and 11,500-ton colliers are relatively inefficient and are gradually disappearing from the seas through obsolescence and conversion to larger, more efficient vessels.

Supertankers are presently available for this service to Salem Harbor and the first self-unloading supercollier of 24,000-ton capacity, designed for operation between Norfolk and Salem Harbor, is under construction for Pocahontas Fuel Co. and scheduled for delivery in September 1958. Other such colliers are scheduled for future delivery.

The economies obtainable from the use of these modern vessels cannot be realized with the channel in its present condition. Supertankers cannot transit the channel except under fractional loading of the vessel, and the 24,000-ton collier can not reach its unloading position even under high tide conditions without extensive changes in channel alignment and the enlarging and deepening of both the turning basin and berth, all of which work should be accomplished simultaneously with the 32-foot Federal navigation project.

Federal expenditures at Salem Harbor date back to 1875, but to date the total of such expenditures is believed to be about \$120,000, of which only about one-third has been applicable to the present ship channel through which the heavy fuel traffic is carried.

Legislatively, the resurvey of Salem Harbor was authorized by the Chief of Engineers on May 18, 1950, but progress on the study was slow because of lack of funds. Meanwhile on February 7, 1951, the division engineer issued a permit for improvements to the wharf facilities in Salem Harbor, and on March 2, 1951, he authorized the private dredging of a berth, turning basin, and short approach channel in order that the urgent demands for fuel could, at least partially, be met during the Korean war period when Federal civil works were yielding to the more urgent requirements of the war effort.

The division engineer submitted his Salem Harbor review of reports on April 20, 1956, in time for prompt approval by the Board of Engineers for River and Harbors and inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 12080, which was passed by both Houses of the 84th Congress, 2d session. The division engineer's report recommended the dredging of the Salem Harbor navigation channel to a depth of 32 feet at a Federal cost of \$1,100,000, and pointed out that the total local expenditures, private and public, in connection with port developments directly related to deep-draft shipping, have amounted to \$836,000, and that local interests have furnished satisfactory evidence of their meeting the requirements of local cooperation in connection with the recommended 32-foot project, including an estimated 455,000 of local capital expenditures.

Unfortunately for Salem Harbor, the omnibus bill was vetoed by the President on August 10, 1956, although assurance was promptly forthcoming from the Department of the Army that the President's action on the bill need cause no delay in starting the Salem Harbor project or the many other worthwhile projects in the bill H. R. 12080.

From a defense standpoint, Salem Harbor is well recommended. Its remoteness from target centers is such that the Office of Defense Mobilization issued in 1956 a certificate of necessity for the expansion of power facilities here as being necessary in the interest of national defense. This was preceded by firm recommendations by both the United States and the Massachusetts Department of Commerce since the facility would serve both the defense and defense-supporting facilities in eastern Massachusetts, and its location is such as to conform with the national dispersion program. No bridges or other hazards threaten the access to Salem Harbor.

The new omnibus rivers and harbors bill, S. 497, of the 85th Congress, was introduced on January 9, 1957. The Senate passed the omnibus bill on March 28, 1957, but Congress adjourned on August 30, 1957, without further action on this bill or on the separate Salem Harbor legislation.

The phenomenal increase in transportation at Salem Harbor during the past 7 years has so strained the navigation facilities that shipping has become hazardous and most inefficient. The intermediate sized vessels serving this port are forced to make the channel run during the short duration of the twice daily high tide conditions. Delays are extensive. The assured increases in Salem Harbor fuel requirements in the immediate future, combined with the necessary introduction of the larger ships, will greatly compound not only the inefficiencies, but also the hazards of the present navigation facilities.

Thus, it is imperative that the legislative bottleneck be broken and that the necessary Federal authorization, appropriation and construction of the 32-foot modification of the Salem Harbor navigation

project be accomplished without further delays.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising to speak on this measure and to advocate its passage is because of my very deep concern with the trend in the American economy that is becoming clearer and clearer as every day passes. Let me state in the beginning that my confidence in this country remains at the highest. We will as a Nation, I am sure, face up to what is necessary regarding the current problem facing us all—the ever-increasing number of unemployed.

Just today, Mr. Chairman, the regular monthly joint announcement of the Departments of Labor and Commerce on the total number of unemployed in the country was released. This information indicates that as of the end of February of 1958 there was a frightening total of 5,173,000 individuals out of work. This is the highest figure reported in this regular bulletin in a 1-month period since August of 1941, and represents more than 6 percent of the total working force of the Nation. In fact, it is 6.7 percent, which is an increase of nine-tenths of 1 percent over the previous month. The figure, incidentally, is equal to almost twice the total population of the entire San Francisco Bay area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all over the country we see spots of unemployment, which are growing larger right next to areas which are still in the boom of prosperity and the height of inflationary trends continues apace in these particular instances. This is a very paradoxical economic situation, one which is almost unheard of in modern times.

I was glad to support the recent introduction of resolutions on both sides of the Congress, which will indicate the urgency of the situation and the seriousness in which this picture is viewed by the majority of this Congress. These resolutions call for a speedup of military and civilian construction programs for which appropriations have been made.

These are steps in the right direction. But, we must go further than this. It is startling and thought-provoking to me to read in the newspapers that this Congress is considering "PWA projects." Mr. Chairman, I believe that these projects must proceed as quickly as possible.

We have before us today a bill which will place over \$1 billion of Federal funds into the mainstream of the economy through public-works projects on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and other purposes. This bill is necessary to help strengthen the economy today. Although it has been sometimes referred to as pork-barrel legislation, this is primarily a job-producing piece of legislation and will provide employment opportunities that are desperately needed.

This bill will act as a two-edged sword. It will, first, provide those very necessary dams, flood-control projects, water storage, and other necessary public-works developments. Secondly, it will give employment to thousands in the building and construction trades, and help forestall further increases in unemployment.

The American people recently heard the White House announcement that

March would mark the beginning of the upturn in jobs. Mr. Chairman, the figures cited here on the floor this afternoon do not exactly herald an upturn. I might also point out that regardless of statements by some of the administration leaders, this five-million plus who are out of work are not the seasonally unemployed. No, this is a hard recession and I pray to God that it is not the start of a hard depression.

I emphasize today to my colleagues, Members of the House, that we must pass this bill as reported to us by the Committee on Public Works. We must pass it by such an overwhelming vote that the Chief Executive cannot veto this measure.

This Congress, under the leadership of our distinguished Speaker and the able Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, can and will enact a program which will be a beacon of light to those 5 million who are desperately looking for work.

This administration appears to be following the belief of "too little and too late" established during that past and unlamented administration in the early part of 1930. We cannot let this happen again, Mr. Chairman. This Congress must assist by public works programs, tax adjustments, and other measures in stemming this ever increasing flow of unemployed.

Let us get down to the business of today and enact this legislation and speed it down to the White House.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge the House to pass S. 497 as amended by the Blatnik amendment. It is a good bill. America has waited 4 long years now for a rivers and harbors and flood-control bill.

Unemployment is growing. The policies of the depression twins of hard money and high interest are being felt by a growing number of our fellow citizens. If these conditions continue for much longer it will be necessary that our country undertake widespread projects of public works in the battle against unemployment.

This bill is, of course, well justified on other grounds, but I did want to point out that when it is enacted into law it may be called upon to play a dual role against the galloping unemployment of our times.

Some say we already have a backlog of unbuilt projects. That is true, and I for one look forward to the day when we are able to build every single one of them.

In my area of the country in this backlog is the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. It is a great project. It is needed. It is justified. It will constitute a most important and valuable addition to our Nation's inland waterway system. I look forward to the time it can be built.

One of the important projects in the bill now before us is the flood control project on 22 tributary streams of the Tombigbee River. This project has been before the Congress nearly 20 years. The late, great, Speaker William B. Bankhead who at that time represented the District that I am privileged to represent today was interested in this project.

Three of these 22 tributary streams drain a large portion of the 7th Congressional District of Alabama. These are the Buttahatchee, the Luxapallila, and the Sipsey Rivers.

The rainfall in this area is about 52 inches per year. The area is subjected to violent, flash rainstorms of 1 or 2 inches at a time. The area floods from 4 to 7 times per year.

The annual average damage done by floods along the Buttahatchee, the Luxapallila, and the Sipsey is \$352,000.

The minority side of the committee is opposed to this project because, its members say, we who are to be benefited by this \$20 million project should pay a greater share of the costs of the project.

The Corps of United States Engineers originally recommended that the local contribution for these projects be fixed at \$6,338,000. That is the amount that minority members are insisting upon this afternoon. That is the amount they insisted upon yesterday. It is the amount they insisted upon in the committee. It is the amount that the President insisted upon in 1956 when he vetoed the bill containing this project.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is unrealistic to insist that the local areas to be benefited by this project raise \$6,338,000. They cannot do it. If the Congress puts this requirement on them it just means that this much-needed project will go unbuilt. The floods in the area will continue to do their damage each year.

Mr. Chairman, just think of it: In the past 20 years the floods along the Buttahatchee, the Luxapallila and the Sipsey have done \$7 million worth of damage. Some idea of the impact of these floods can be gained when we consider that Fayette County, Alabama, drained by the Sipsey and the Luxapallila, had a real-estate tax valuation of \$9,636,000 in 1957. This information was furnished me this morning by Hon. A. A. Nichols, tax assessor.

The assessed real estate valuation of Lamar County, Alabama, drained by the Buttahatchee and the Luxapallila was \$8,160,295 in 1957. This information was furnished me this morning by Hon. G. M. Boman, tax assessor.

The assessed real estate value of Pickens County, Ala., partially drained by the Sipsey River, was \$5,735,220 in 1957.

I submit that these figures do not indicate that this area of Alabama can pay its pro rata share of the \$6,338,000 local contribution which the minority members of the House Committee on Public Works are insisting on.

I want to be a bit more specific. Under the Corps of United States Engineers recommendation of \$6,338,000 as local contributions to this \$20 million project, Lamar County, Ala., would have \$323,300 assessed against it; \$297,100 of this would be for local contribution to the improvement of the Buttahatchee in Lamar County, \$26,200 would be the local contribution toward improvement of the Luxapallila in Lamar County. Pickens County, Ala., would have to pay a local contribution toward the improvement of the Sipsey River in Pickens County of \$276,900. Fayette County would be called upon for a local contribution of \$1,013,400 for the improve-

ment of the Sipsey River in Fayette County.

This area of Alabama cannot pay these amounts which total \$1,613,000.

In 1956 Fayette County had a per capita income of \$757; Lamar County, \$717; Pickens County, \$685. These figures just came to me by wire, in answer to my request, from the Bureau of Business Research of the University of Alabama. They are preliminary and heretofore unpublished.

The floods which I speak of are making this area of Alabama proportionately poorer. It cannot pay these high assessments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the House Committee for lowering the recommended assessments for local contributions by 75 percent from \$6,338,000 to \$1,585,000. It will be hard for the local interests to raise this money, but it is a much more realistic figure than the higher one.

Continued flood losses have reduced the ability of these counties to pay a large sum for construction of flood-control projects.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this bill. I urge it to retain and approve the Tombigbee tributaries project just like it is contained in the Blatnik amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have two technical amendments at the desk, simply to correct the date, which I offer at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 24, line 11, strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958"; on page 57, line 22, strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, if we pass Senate bill 497 and adopt the committee amendments today, and then bring about an acceleration of the road building program, together with construction of post offices and other much needed Federal buildings, and pass a tax-reduction bill for the low income tax groups, take off certain excise taxes and extend unemployment compensation, I am sure that it will restore confidence to the people and will encourage private industry to expand. Our economy is strong and can stand these expenditures. If this is done, and I sincerely hope it will, I am certain that this recession will end within the next 90 days.

It is my privilege to represent one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country and I make it a habit to speak to some manufacturers of my District every week and I can tell you



plainly they are all scared. I also have the largest district in the country of saving and loan associations. There are 58 in my District and I may say to you they are all doing well. People have the money but are afraid of another depression, as we had in the early 30's, and I don't blame them. All they need is confidence, encouragement, and we as Members of Congress can give it to them. Let us start right now. Let us adopt the committee amendments to Senate 497 and pass it today.

Mr. MORGAN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, S. 497—H. R. 11121—as amended, carries an authorization of \$1,286,000 for construction of a flood control project at Chartiers Creek, which flows through the city of Washington and the township of Canton in my Congressional District. Washington is the seat of Washington County and is an important industrial and commercial center. The part of Canton Township adjacent to Washington in Chartiers Creek Valley is also an industrial area. Floods have occurred in this area since 1912, but from year to year the peak stages have increased in height. In August 1956 flood damage amounted to \$6,243,000. The average annual direct flood damages for the area is estimated at about \$60,200. The floods affect certain industrial plants, railroads, highways, sewer systems and some business establishments. A residential area of from 300 to 400 homes is practically isolated when the highway is flooded. Indirect flood damages occur from suspension of industrial and commercial activities. The secession of normal business operations brought about by these repeated floods are reflected over a considerable payroll period and produces a nonrecoverable economic loss to the community. The losses of wages and loss of production and sales cannot be compensated for at a later time.

In 1947 I introduced House Document No. 306 to have the Corps of Engineers make an investigation to determine the advisability of Federal assistance in alleviating the floods in Chartiers Creek area. A preliminary investigation was made. A further investigation was made in 1948. In 1950 the preliminary investigation report was submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. In 1951 a survey was authorized by the Chief of Engineers. In August 1956 the survey report was submitted by the district engineer to the Chief of Engineers. The report recommended a plan of channel improvement which would consist of widening and deepening the channel of Chartiers Creek, together with some realignment. The Corps of Engineers feels that this plan would provide a high degree of protection against floods and would be feasible and economically justified.

The project was approved by the Senate last year, but was taken from the House bill in July 1957 because the offi-

cial report had not been submitted to Congress. Favorable reports have now been received from the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, and the reports have been transmitted to Congress in House Document No. 286.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very worthy project and is vitally needed in my District. It is essential to the preservation of life and the protection of property. I hope the amendment will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Blatnik amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment as amended by the Blatnik amendment.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 497, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 490, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. As I understand, owing to the provisions of the rule it is impossible to get a separate vote on the amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCGREGOR moves that S. 497 as amended be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all of the projects not approved by the Corps of Engineers according to law and insert in lieu of S. 497 as amended, the following: The provisions of H. R. 11121, as amended:

#### "TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with

the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

#### "Navigation

"Salem Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 31, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,100,000;

"Boston Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 349, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$720,000;

"East Boat Basin, Cape Cod Canal, Mass.: House Document No. 168, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$360,000;

"Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.: House Document No. 136, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000;

"New York Harbor, N. Y.: Senate Document No. 45, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,678,000;

"Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: House Document No. 86, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,161,000;

"Herring Creek, Md.: House Document No. 159, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$110,000;

"Betterton Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 333, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$78,000;

"Delaware River anchorages: House Document No. 185, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$24,447,000;

"Hull Creek, Va.: House Document No. 287, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$269,800;

"Morehead City Harbor, N. C.: Senate Document No. 54, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,197,000;

"Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.: House Document No. 222, 85th Congress, maintenance;

"Port Everglades Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 346, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,683,000;

"Escambia River, Fla.: House Document No. 75, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$61,000;

"Gulfport Harbor, Miss.: Senate Document No. 123, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Barataria Bay, La.: House Document No. 82, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,647,000;

"Chefuncte River and Bogue Falia, La.: Senate Document No. 54, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$48,000;

"Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 131, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000;

"Galveston Harbor and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.: House Document No. 350, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$17,196,000;

"Matagorda Ship Channel, Port Lavaca, Tex.: House Document No. 388, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,944,000;

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 10, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$6,272,000;

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., La Quinta Channel: Future maintenance in accordance with Senate Document No. 33, 85th Congress: *Provided*, That local interests shall not be reimbursed for funds contributed for this improvement;

"Freeport Harbor, Tex.: House Document No. 433, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$317,000;

"Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts; House Document No. 135,

84th Congress, at the estimated cost of \$2,476,000;

"Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., commercial harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$246,000;

"Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., small-boat harbor: House Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$62,000: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

"Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa., Beaver Slough: House Document No. 345, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$241,000;

"Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, report on damages: House Document No. 412, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$147,000;

"Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam No. 26: Senate Document No. 7, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,802,000;

"Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Modification of the existing project in the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., House Document No. 33, 85th Congress;

"Minnesota River, Minn.: Senate Document No. 144, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,539,000: *Provided*, That the channel may be extended five-tenths of a mile upstream to mile 14.7 at an estimated additional cost of \$5,000;

"Vermillion Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 231, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$474,000;

"Ohio River at Gallipolis, Ohio: House Document No. 423, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

"Licking River, Ky.: House Document No. 434, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Saxon Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 169, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$393,500;

"Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 362, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$66,000;

"Port Washington Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 446, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,760,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute 43½ percent of the total cost of the project;

"St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.: Senate Document No. 95, 84th Congress, maintenance;

"Old Channel of Rouge River, Mich.: House Document No. 135, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,500;

"Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 107, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,927,000;

"Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 436, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$859,000;

"Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.: House Document No. 332, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,865,000: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of the general navigation facilities shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

"Santa Cruz Harbor, Santa Cruz, Calif.: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 27, 1958, at an estimated cost of \$1,612,000;

"Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 8, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,800,000;

"Siuslaw River, Oreg.: House Document No. 204, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,693,100;

"Port Townsend Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 418, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$387,000;

"Bellingham Harbor, Wash.: Senate Document No. 46, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$83,700;

"Douglas and Juneau Harbors, Alaska: House Document No. 286, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,394,000;

"Dillingham Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$372,000;

"Naknek River, Alaska: House Document No. 390, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,000;

"Cook Inlet, navigation improvements, Alaska: House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,199,200;

"San Juan Harbor, P. R.: House Document No. 38, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,476,800;

#### "Beach erosion

"State of Connecticut, area 9, East River to New Haven Harbor: House Document No. 395, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,000;

"Connecticut shoreline, areas 8 and 11, Saugatuck River to Byram River: House Document No. 174, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$229,000;

"Fire Island Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.: House Document No. 411, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,724,000;

"Atlantic coast of New Jersey, Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet: House Document No. 332, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,755,000;

"Delaware coast from Kitts Hummock to Fenwick Island, Del.: House Document No. 216, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$28,000;

"Palm Beach County, from Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: House Document No. 342, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$222,500;

"Berrien County, Mich.: House Document No. 336, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$226,000;

"Manitowoc County, Wis.: House Document No. 348, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$50,000;

"Fair Haven Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 134, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$114,000;

"Hamlin Beach State Park, N. Y.: House Document No. 138, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$404,000;

"Humboldt Bay, Calif.: House Document No. 282, 85th Congress, as an estimated cost of \$38,200;

"Santa Cruz County, Calif.: House Document No. 179, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$516,000;

"San Diego County, Calif.: House Document No. 399, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$289,000;

"Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay Island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii: House Document No. 432, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,000.

"Sec. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them, on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

"Sec. 103. That pending fulfillment of the conditions of local cooperation for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Algiers Canal, as authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for maintenance of rivers and harbors may be used for operation and maintenance of the railroad bridge over Algiers Canal for the period from September 1, 1956, to December 31, 1958.

"Sec. 104. That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia,

Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated additional cost for the expanded program over that now under way of \$1,350,000 annually for 5 years, of which 50 percent, presently estimated at \$675,000, shall be borne by the United States and 50 percent presently estimated at \$675,000, by local interests, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, published as House Document No. 37, 85th Congress: *Provided*, That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of the additional program: *Provided further*, That Federal funds appropriated for this project shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.

"Sec. 105. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for navigation and allied purposes to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

"Sec. 106. That the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 156, 82d Congress; and the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across Saint George Island, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 557, 82d Congress, are hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon the projects insofar as this work shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the projects adopted by the act of 1954: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be based upon the reduction, in the amount of material which will have to be removed to provide project dimensions at such time as Federal dredging of the channels is undertaken: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto and shall not take precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority.

"Sec. 107. That the improvements of Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cutoff, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done on this project, within the limits of the Federal portion of the project, over and above any items required as a part of the local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with project modification adopted in said act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$44,000: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations therefor and shall not have precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority: *And provided further*, That no reimbursement to local interests shall be made until they have met all the requirements of local cooperation in the



recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress.

"Sec. 108. That the Federal project structures, appurtenances, and real property of the Upper Fox River, Wis., shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the United States to any portion of the said property may, regardless of any other provision of law, be conveyed, upon such terms and conditions as may be advisable: *Provided further*, That, if the State of Wisconsin offers to take over said property under the terms and conditions hereinafter prescribed, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to said State, without monetary consideration, all such right, title, and interest of the United States in said property, and the United States shall thereafter have no further obligations with respect to the property so conveyed. In consideration of the State accepting such conveyance and assuming responsibility for said property, there is hereby authorized to be expended from appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army toward the work of placing the project facilities in a condition suitable for public purposes, not to exceed \$300,000. The Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the State with respect to the details of the work to be performed and transfer of the property. If the State fails to present a satisfactory offer within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, said property may be disposed of pursuant to the provisions of existing law and upon such terms and conditions as may be determined to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That, after acceptance of said property by the State of Wisconsin, the Federal laws, other than the Federal Power Act, governing the protection and preservation of navigable waters shall not apply to the reach of the Upper Fox River, Wis., above its juncture with the mouth of the Wolf River.

"Sec. 109. The project for the Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Ill., and Ind. (Calumet-Sag navigation project), authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations in House Document No. 45, 85th Congress, insofar as they apply to existing highway bridges in part I, Sag Junction to Lake Calumet, at an estimated additional cost of \$9,884,000.

"Sec. 110 (a) The Secretary of the Army hereby is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States the fee simple title in and to the lands in the lake (known as Sissippi Lake) created by the Government dam constructed across Rock River between Sterling and Rock Falls, Ill., and over which the United States now holds flowage rights or easement, and in and to all other lands upon which the United States has rights or easements used for the purpose of and appurtenant to the operation of the Federal project known as the Illinois and Mississippi Canal (which lake, canal, feeder, and appurtenances thereto are referred to collectively in this section as the canal) in the State of Illinois; said fee simple title to be acquired subject to the continuing right of access to Sissippi Lake by the riparian owners whose land adjoins and abuts said lake. Such acquisition may be accomplished by purchase, acceptance of donation, exchange, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or otherwise.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized out of appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, to cause the canal to be repaired and modified for the purpose of placing the same in proper condition for public recreational use other than through-navigation, including (but not limited to) the repair or reconstruction of the aforesaid Government dam across Rock River; the re-

pair or reconstruction of retaining walls, embankments, and fixed portions of the lock and dam structures, on both the feeder and the main portions of the canal; the removal of presently existing lock gates and the construction of fixed dams in lieu thereof; the repair of culverts, drainage ditches, fences, and other structures and improvements, except bridges and roads, which the United States has maintained or has been obligated to maintain; the replacement of aqueducts with inverted siphons, or flumes; such other repair, renovation, or reconstruction work as the Chief of Engineers may deem necessary or advisable to prepare the canal for public recreational use other than through-navigation; and the sale or other disposition of equipment, buildings, and other structures, which are designated by the State of Illinois as not suitable or needed for such use. The work of repair and modification shall be performed by the Corps of Engineers, and upon completion thereof the Chief of Engineers shall certify such completion to the Secretary of the Army. The work of repair and modification authorized in this subsection, as well as the land acquisition authorized in the preceding subsection, shall not be commenced prior to the approval by the Chief of Engineers and the responsible State representative of the agreement authorized in subsection (e) which shall include assurance from the State of Illinois that it will accept the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal. Upon such conveyance the United States shall have no further obligation with respect to the canal.

"(c) Upon the request of the State of Illinois and of any corporation owning a railroad which crosses a bridge over the canal, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to said corporation, at any time before the conveyance of the canal to the State of Illinois as provided in subsection (d) of this section, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such bridge, and the delivery of any such bridge conveyance shall operate as a complete release and discharge of the United States from all further obligation with respect to such bridge. If the request also provides for the replacement of such bridge with a land fill, the Secretary of the Army further is authorized to permit the said corporation to make such replacement, but shall require adequate provision for culverts and other structures allowing passage of the waters of the canal and necessary drainage, and for right-of-way for necessary and appropriate road crossings.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army further is authorized and directed, upon execution of the foregoing provisions of this section, to convey and transfer to the State of Illinois, by quitclaim deed and such other instruments as the Secretary may deem appropriate, without further consideration, the property of the canal; and to execute such other documents and to perform such other acts as shall be necessary and appropriate to complete the transfer to the said State of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal. Upon and after the delivery of such deed, the State of Illinois is authorized, at all times, to use such quantity of water drawn from Rock River at Sissippi Lake, as is adequate and appropriate to operate the canal for public recreational use other than through-navigation.

"(e) In the execution of the provisions of this section, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized representatives of the State of Illinois with respect to the details of repair and modification of the canal and the transfer thereof to the State.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2 million to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation,

flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of the Government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable actual cost of such remedial work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of the date of this act, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.

"Sec. 112. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Stave Island Harbor at South Goldsboro, Maine.

"Short Sands Section of York Beach, York County, Maine.

"Tashmoo Pond, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.

"Sachem's Head Harbor at Guilford, Conn.

"Poquonock River at Groton, Conn.

"Hammonds Cove, entrance to Locust Point Harbor, Long Island Sound, N. Y.

"Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, and up White's Creek, Del.

"Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.

"Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, with a view to elimination of the water chestnut (*Trapa Natans*).

"Area from Cuckold Creek through Neale Creek and Neale Sound to the Wicomico River, Charles County, Md., to determine the feasibility of providing a safe and continuous inland channel for the navigation of small boats.

"Currioman Bay, Va.

"Tabbs Creek, Lancaster County, Va.

"Wrights Creek, N. C.

"Savannah River, with a view to providing 9-foot navigation to Augusta, Ga.

"Little Gasparilla Pass, Charlotte County, Fla.

"Frenchman Creek, Fla.

"Trinity River, Tex.

"Streams and harbor facilities and needs therefor at and in the vicinity of Bayport, Fla., in the interest of present and prospective commerce and other purposes, with the view of improving the harbor facilities of Bayport as a port for commerce and for refuge on the Gulf of Mexico.

"Channel from Lynn Haven Bayou, Fla., into North Bay, Fla.

"Small-boat channel from the port of Panacea, Fla., into Apalachee Bay, Fla.

"Dredged channel, vicinity of Sunshine Skyway, Tampa Bay, Fla.

"Tampa Bay, Fla., with a view to determining the feasibility of a fresh water lake at that location.

"Apalachicola River Chipola Cutoff, Fla., via Wewahitchka, with a view to providing a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

"Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of Gulfport, Fla.

"Missouri River, with a view to extending 9-foot navigation from Sioux City, Iowa, to Gavins Point Dam, South Dakota-Nebraska.

"Channel from Port Inland, Mich., to deep water in Lake Michigan.

"Connecting channel between Namakan Lake and Ash River, Minn.

"Camp Pendleton Harbor and Oceanside, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted toward recommended beach erosion control measures at Oceanside, Calif., in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

"Anaheim Bay, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

"Sec. 113. Title I may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1957.'

#### "TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"Sec. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interest shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

#### "New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 59, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$15,490,000.

#### "Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts

"The project for hurricane-flood protection in the Narragansett Bay area, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 230, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,180,000.

#### "Connecticut River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$24 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the construction of the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of Westfield River, Mass., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 17, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,090,000.

"The project for the Mad River Dam and Reservoir on the Mad River above Winsted, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,430,000.

#### "Housatonic River Basin

"The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington and Goshen, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,960,000.

"The project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on the East Branch of the Naugatuck River in Torrington, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 81, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,780,000.

#### "Hudson River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Mohawk River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 172, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,069,000: *Provided*, That the works at Rome, N. Y., shall not be constructed until a report showing economic justification has been completed by the Chief of Engineers.

#### "Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C.

"The project for flood protection on Pantego and Cucklers Creek, N. C., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 398, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$413,000.

#### "Savannah River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of Hartwell Reservoir, approved in the Flood Control Acts of December 22, 1944, and May 17, 1950, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 657, 78th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44.3 million.

#### "Central and southern Florida

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood con-

trol and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent acts of Congress, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for canals, levees, water control structures on the west side of the Everglades agricultural and conservation areas in Hendry County, Fla., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 48, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,172,000.

#### "Mobile River Basin

"(Tombigbee, Warrior, and Alabama-Coosa)

"The project for flood control and related purposes on the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 167, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,445,400.

"The project for flood protection on the Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 83, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1.3 million.

#### "Lower Mississippi River

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following items and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly:

"(a) Modification of the White River backwater project, Arkansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 26, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost, over that now authorized, of \$1,613,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall grant to the White River Drainage District of Phillips and Desha Counties, Ark., such permits, rights-of-way, and easements over lands of the United States in the White River Migratory Refuge, as the Chief of Engineers may determine to be required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of this project: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 31.2 percent of the cost of the project in cash or equivalent work, and to operate and maintain the pumping plant after completion.

"(b) Modification and extension of plans of improvement in the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon Basin, Ark., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 108, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$631,000: *Provided*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute 48 percent of the cost of providing major drainage in cash or equivalent work, to furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, and to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works.

"(c) In addition to the previous authorization, the sum of \$28,200,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement for the control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a navigation lock approved in the act of September 3, 1954.

"(d) In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of \$35,674,000 for prosecution of the plan of improvement in the St. Francis River Basin approved in the act of May 17, 1950.



"(e) The project for flood protection on Wolf River and tributaries, Tennessee, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 76, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,932,000.

"(f) The project for flood protection and related purposes on Bayou Chevreuil, La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$547,000: *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with the recommended plan as determined by the Chief of Engineers, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests.

*"Red-Ouachita River Basin*

"The general plan for flood control on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is modified and expanded, at an estimated cost in addition to that now authorized of \$53,235,000, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 170, 85th Congress, on Millwood Reservoir and alternate reservoirs, Little River, Okla. and Ark.

*"Gulf of Mexico*

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Galveston Bay, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Texas City, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 347, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,166,000.

*"Arkansas River Basin*

"The project for the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 325, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,628,000.

"The first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma,' approved July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), is amended by inserting after 'as recommended by the Chief of Engineers,' the following: 'or such additional flood storage or pool elevations, or both, as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.'

*"White River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the sum of \$45 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the White River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

*"Pecos River Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Pecos River at Carlsbad, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 224, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,792,000.

*"Rio Grande Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at Socorro, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 58, 85th Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of \$3,103,000.

*"Upper Mississippi River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$21 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the upper Mississippi River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and

supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

"The project for flood protection on the Rock and Green Rivers, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 173, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,996,000.

"The project for flood protection on Eau Galle River at Spring Valley, Wis., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 52, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,690,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at Winona, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 324, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$1,620,000.

"The projects for flood protection on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 223, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,705,500.

"The project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 437, 84th Congress at an estimated cost of \$1,870,000.

"The project for the Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 9, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40 million: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash 10 percent of the cost of the project in recognition of the water supply benefits of the project.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1957, at an estimated cost of \$23 million: *Provided*, That, in addition to the requirements for local cooperation recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, local interests agree to contribute in cash or equivalent work a percentage of the cost of Carlyle Reservoir and Levee Districts 3, 4, 8, 10, and 13, calculated on the same basis as cost sharing for the other projects recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers.

"The project for flood protection on the Root River at Rushford, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 431, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$796,000.

*"Great Lakes Basin*

"The project for flood protection on the Bad River at Mellen and Odanah, Wis., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 165, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Kalamazoo, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,358,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 132, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,825,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Saginaw River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 346, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,085,000.

"The project for flood protection on Oswego Outlet, tributary of Oswego River, at Auburn, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 133, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$305,000.

*"Missouri River Basin*

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress: *Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to any dam in such plan to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, an equitable proportion of such power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed.

"The project for flood protection on the Sun River, at Great Falls, Mont., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 343, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,405,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Cannonball River, at Mott, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 35, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$434,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Floyd River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 417, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,060,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Black Vermillion River at Frankfort, Kans., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 409, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$850,000.

"The project for flood protection in the Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 139, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,214,000.

"The project for flood control on Salt Creek and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 396, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,314,000.

"The project for flood protection on Shell Creek, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 187, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,025,000.

*"Red River of the North Basin*

"The project for flood protection on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 141, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$632,000.

*"Ohio River Basin*

"The project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 316, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,272,000.

"The project for the upper Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on Brush Creek at Princeton, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 122, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$917,000.

"The project for flood protection on Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$708,000.

"The project for flood protection on Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River at Jamestown, N. J., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 103, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,796,000.

"The project for flood protection on the west branch of the Mahoning River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 191, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,585,000.

"The project for flood protection on Charlers Creek, at and in the vicinity of Washington, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 286, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,286,000.

"The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Brookville, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 166, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,188,000.

"The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin is modified to provide for a reservoir at the Monroe Reservoir site, mile 25.6, on Salt Creek, White River Basin, Ind., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 192, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,359,000.

#### "Sacramento River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$17 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

"The project for flood protection on the Sacramento River from Chico Landing to Red Bluff, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 272, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,560,000.

#### "Eel River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Eel River in the Sandy Prairie region, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 80, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$707,000.

#### "Weber River Basin, Utah

"The project for flood protection on the Weber River and tributaries, Utah, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 158, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$520,000.

#### "San Joaquin River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$13 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

#### "Kaweah and Tule River Basins

"In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan

approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of \$28 million.

#### "Los Angeles River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$44 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress.

#### "Santa Ana River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$8 million, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent act of Congress.

#### "San Dieguito River Basin

"The project for the San Dieguito River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 288, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,961,000.

#### "Columbia River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$112 million, for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, and September 3, 1954.

"In carrying out the review of House Document No. 531, 81st Congress, 2d session, and other reports on the Columbia River and its tributaries, pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate dated July 28, 1955, the Chief of Engineers shall be guided by flood-control goals not less than those contained in said House Document No. 531.

#### "Sammamish River Basin

"The projects for flood protection and related purposes on the Sammamish River, Wash., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$825,000.

#### "Territory of Alaska

"The project for flood protection on Chena River at Fairbanks, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,727,000.

"The project for flood protection at Cook Inlet, Alaska (Talkeetna), is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 34, 85th Congress, at an estimated cost of \$60,000.

"Sec. 204. That, in recognition of the flood-control accomplishments of the multipurpose Oroville Dam and Reservoir, proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such dam and reservoir and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with the State of California, subject to a finding by the Secretary of the Army, approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Department of the Army and the State of California shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the Oroville Dam in such manner as will produce the flood-control benefits upon

which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the dam for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890): *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army in a manner which shall assure that the annual Federal contribution during the project construction period does not exceed the percentage of the annual expenditure for the Oroville Dam and Reservoir which the total flood-control contribution bears to the total cost of the dam and reservoir: *And provided further*, That unless construction of the Oroville Dam and Reservoir is undertaken within 4 years from the date of enactment of this act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

"Sec. 205. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance and operation of Federal navigation, flood control or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water-supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water-supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.



"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation, is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation flood control or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further*, That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act.

"Sec. 206. (a) In order to provide adjustments in the lands or interests in lands heretofore acquired for the Grapevine, Garza-Little Elm, Benbrook, Belton, and Whitney Reservoir projects in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real estate requirements of the projects the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof whenever he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided, subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No reconveyance shall be made if within 30 days after the last date that

notice of the proposed reconveyance has been published by the Secretary in a local newspaper, an objection in writing is received by the former owner and the Secretary from a present record owner of land abutting a portion of the reservoir made available for reconveyance, unless within 90 days after receipt by the former owner and the Secretary of such notice of objection, the present record owner of land and the former owner involved indicate to the Secretary that agreement has been reached concerning the reconveyance.

"(2) If no agreement is reached between the present record owner of land and the former owner within 90 days after notice of objection has been filed with the former owner and the Secretary, the land made available for reconveyance in accordance with this section shall be reported to the Administrator of General Services for disposal in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377).

"(3) No lands heretofore conveyed to the United States Government by the city of Dallas in connection with the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir project shall be subject to revestment of title to private owners, but shall remain subject to the terms and conditions of the instrument or instruments of conveyance which transferred the title to the United States Government.

"(b) Any such reconveyance of any such land or interests shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as regulations prescribe to the former owner of such land or interests, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interests from such former owner in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

"(c) Any reconveyance of land therein made under this section shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest, except that no mineral rights may be reserved in said lands unless the Secretary finds that such reservation is needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir projects designated in this section.

"(d) Any land reconveyed under this section shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the reservoir projects specified in subsection (a) of this section), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

"(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

"(f) As used in this section the term 'former owner' means the person from whom any land, or interests therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children, or the heirs

at law; and the term 'present record owner of land' shall mean the person or persons in whose name such land shall, on the date of approval of this act, be recorded on the deed records of the respective county in which such land is located.

"(g) The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this section to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

"(h) Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(i) This section shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

"SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

"Streams, river basins, and areas in New York and New Jersey for flood control, major drainage, navigation, channel improvement, and land reclamation, as follows: Hackensack River, Passaic River, Raritan River, Arthur Kill, and Kill Van Kull, including the portions of these river basins in Bergen, Hudson, Essex, Middlesex, Passaic, Union, and Monmouth Counties, N. J.

"Deep Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

"Mills Creek, Fla.

"Streams in Seminole County, Fla., draining into the St. Johns River.

"Streams in Brevard County, Fla., draining Indian River and adjacent coastal areas including Merritt Island, and the area of Turnbull Hammock in Volusia County.

"Lake Pontchartrain, La., in the interest of protecting Salt Bayou Road.

"San Felipe Creek, Tex., at and in the vicinity of Del Rio, Tex.

"El Paso, El Paso County, Tex.

"Rio Grande and tributaries, at and in the vicinity of Fort Hancock, Hudspeth County, Tex.

"Missouri River Basin, S. Dak., with reference to utilization of floodwaters stored in authorized reservoirs for purposes of municipal and industrial use and maintenance of natural lake levels.

"Stump Creek, tributary of North Fork of Mahoning Creek, at Sykesville, Pa.

"Little River and Cayuga Creek, at and in the vicinity of Cayuga Island, Niagara County, N. Y.

"Bird, Caney, and Verdigris Rivers, Okla. and Kans.

"Watersheds of the Illinois River, at and in the vicinity of Chicago, Ill., the Chicago River, Ill., the Calumet River, Ill. and Ind., and their tributaries, and any areas in northeast Illinois and northwest Indiana which drain directly into Lake Michigan with respect to flood control and major drainage problems.

"All streams flowing into Lake St. Clair and Detroit River in Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne Counties, Mich.

"Sacramento River Basin, Calif., with reference to cost allocation studies for Oroville Dam.

"Pescadero Creek, Calif.

"Soquel Creek, Calif.

"San Gregorio Creek and tributaries, California.

"Redwood Creek, San Mateo, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of South San Francisco, Calif.

"Streams at and in the vicinity of Burlingame, Calif.

"Kellogg and Marsh Creeks, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Eastkoot Creek, Stinson Beach area, Marin County, Calif.

"Rodeo Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Pinole Creek, tributary of San Pablo Bay, Contra Costa County, Calif.

"Rogue River, Oreg., in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and allied purposes.

"Kihei District, Island of Maui, T. H.

"Sec. 208. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9 (a) of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public No. 534, 78th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 209. That for preliminary examinations and surveys authorized in previous river and harbor and flood-control acts, the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to cause investigations and reports for flood control and allied purposes, to be prepared under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in the form of survey reports, and that preliminary examination reports shall no longer be required to be prepared.

"Sec. 210. Title II may be cited as the Flood Control Act of 1957."

Mr. MCGREGOR (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that the motion to recommit includes the so-called Mack amendment which has been under consideration for quite some time, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 167, nays 234, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—167

Adair	Bates	Brownson
Alger	Beamer	Broyhill
Allen, Calif.	Becker	Budge
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mich.	Byrne, Ill.
Andersen,	Bentley	Byrnes, Wis.
H. Carl	Berry	Canfield
Arends	Betts	Carrigg
Auchincloss	Bosch	Cederberg
Avery	Bow	Chamberlain
Ayres	Bray	Chipherfield
Baker	Broomfield	Church
Bass, N. H.	Brown, Ohio	Clevenger

Collier	Jenkins	Prouty
Corbett	Jensen	Quie
Coudert	Johansen	Ray
Cramer	Jonas	Reece, Tenn.
Cretella	Judd	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham,	Kean	Rhodes, Ariz.
Nebr.	Kearney	Riehlman
Curtin	Keating	Robison, N. Y.
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Sadak
Curtis, Mo.	Knox	St. George
Dague	Krueger	Schenck
Dennison	Lafore	Scherer
Derounian	Laird	Schwengel
Devereux	Latham	Scudder
Dorn, N. Y.	Lipscomb	Seely-Brown
Dwyer	McCulloch	Sheehan
Fenton	McDonough	Siler
Ford	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Frelinghuysen	McIntire	Smith, Calif.
Fulton	McIntosh	Smith, Kans.
George	McVey	Springer
Glenn	Mack, Wash.	Stauffer
Griffin	Maillard	Taber
Gross	Marshall	Talle
Gubser	Martin	Teague, Calif.
Gwinn	Mason	Tewes
Hale	May	Thomson, Wyo.
Halleck	Meador	Tollefson
Harden	Michel	Utt
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
Harvey	Miller, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Haskell	Minshall	Vorys
Henderson	Moore	Wainwright
Heselton	Morano	Westland
Hess	Mumma	Wharton
Hiestand	Neal	Widnall
Hill	Nimitz	Wigglesworth
Hoeven	Norblad	Wilson, Calif.
Hoffman	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Ind.
Holmes	O'Konski	Withrow
Holt	Osmers	Wolverton
Horan	Ostertag	Younger
Hosmer	Pelly	
Hyde	Pillion	
Jackson	Poff	

NAYS—234

Abbutt	Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.
Abernethy	Dingell	Keogh
Addonizio	Dixon	Kilday
Albert	Dollinger	Kilgore
Alexander	Donohue	King
Mont.	Dooley	Kirwan
Andrews	Dorn, S. C.	Kitchin
Anfuso	Dowdy	Kluczyński
Ashley	Doyle	Knutson
Ashmore	Edmondson	Landrum
Aspinall	Elliott	Lane
Bailey	Engle	Lankford
Baldwin	Everett	LeCompte
Barden	Evens	Lennon
Baring	Fallon	Lesinski
Barrett	Farbstein	Libonati
Bass, Tenn.	Fascell	Long
Baumhart	Feighan	Loser
Beckworth	Fino	McCarthy
Belcher	Fisher	McCormack
Bennett, Fla.	Flood	McFall
Blatnik	Forand	McGovern
Blicht	Forrester	McMillan
Boggs	Fountain	Macdonald
Boland	Frazier	Machrowicz
Bolling	Friedel	Mack, Ill.
Bonner	Garmatz	Madden
Boyle	Gary	Magnuson
Breeding	Gathings	Mahon
Brooks, La.	Gavin	Matthews
Brooks, Tex.	Gray	Merrow
Brown, Ga.	Green, Oreg.	Metcalf
Brown, Mo.	Gregory	Miller, Calif.
Burleson	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Byrd	Hagen	Mills
Byrne, Pa.	Haley	Mitchell
Cannon	Harris	Montoya
Carnahan	Harrison, Va.	Allen, Ill.
Celler	Hays, Ark.	Andersen
Chelf	Hays, Ohio	H. Carl
Chenoweth	Healey	Anderson,
Christopher	Hébert	Mont.
Clark	Hemphill	Andrews
Coad	Herlong	Anfuso
Coffin	Hollfield	Ashley
Colmer	Holland	Ashmore
Cooley	Holtzman	Aspinall
Cunningham,	Huddleston	Auchincloss
Iowa	Hull	Avery
Davis, Ga.	Ikard	Bailey
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Baker
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Baldwin
Dawson, Utah	Johnson	Barden
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Baring
Dellay	Jones, Mo.	Barrett
Denton	Karsten	Bass, Tenn.
	Kearns	Bates
	Kee	Baumhart
		Beamer
		Beckworth

Polk	Santangelo	Thornberry
Porter	Saund	Trimble
Powell	Saylor	Tuck
Preston	Scott, N. C.	Ullman
Price	Selden	Vanik
Rabaut	Shelley	Vinson
Reed	Sheppard	Walter
Reuss	Sikes	Watts
Rhodes, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.	Weaver
Riley	Sisk	Whitener
Rivers	Smith, Miss.	Whitten
Robeson, Va.	Smith, Va.	Wier
Robson, Ky.	Spence	Williams, Miss.
Rodino	Staggers	Willis
Rogers, Colo.	Sullivan	Winstead
Rogers, Fla.	Teague, Tex.	Wright
Rogers, Mass.	Teller	Yates
Rogers, Tex.	Thomas	Young
Rooney	Thompson, La.	Zablocki
Roosevelt	Thompson, N. J.	Zelenko
Rutherford	Thompson, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—30

Bolton	Fogarty	Rains
Boykin	Gordon	Roberts
Buckley	Granahan	Scott, Pa.
Burdick	Grant	Shuford
Bush	Green, Pa.	Steminski
Dempsey	Hardy	Steed
Dies	Hillings	Taylor
Durham	James	Udall
Eberharter	Murray	Vursell
Flynt	Radwan	Williams, N. Y.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Buckley against.  
 Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Boykin against.  
 Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Durham against.  
 Mr. James for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, against.  
 Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Fogarty against.  
 Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Rains against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Vursell with Mr. Dies.  
 Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Granahan.  
 Mr. Bush with Mr. Grant.  
 Mr. Burdick with Mr. Steed.

Mr. O'NEILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 321, nays 81, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—321

Abernethy	Belcher	Celler
Addonizio	Bennett, Fla.	Chamberlain
Albert	Bennett, Mich.	Chelf
Alexander	Bentley	Chenoweth
Allen, Calif.	Berry	Chipherfield
Allen, Ill.	Blatnik	Christopher
Andersen	Blicht	Church
H. Carl	Boggs	Clark
Anderson,	Boland	Coad
Mont.	Bolling	Coffin
Andrews	Bonner	Colmer
Anfuso	Boyle	Cooley
Ashley	Bray	Corbett
Ashmore	Brooks, La.	Cretella
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Cunningham,
Auchincloss	Brown, Ga.	Iowa
Avery	Brown, Mo.	Curtin
Bailey	Broyhill	Davis, Ga.
Baker	Burleson	Davis, Tenn.
Baldwin	Bush	Dawson, Ill.
Barden	Byrd	Dawson, Utah
Baring	Byrne, Ill.	Delaney
Barrett	Byrne, Pa.	Dellay
Bass, Tenn.	Canfield	Dennison
Bates	Cannon	Dent
Baumhart	Carnahan	Denton
Beamer	Carrigg	Devereux
Beckworth	Cederberg	Diggs



Dingell  
Dixon  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Dooley  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Doyle  
Edmondson  
Elliott  
Engle  
Everett  
Ewins  
Fallon  
Farbsteln  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Fenton  
Fino  
Fisher  
Flood  
Forand  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
George  
Glenn  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Gregory  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hagen  
Hale  
Haley  
Harden  
Harris  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Healey  
Hébert  
Hemphill  
Herlong  
Hesilton  
Hill  
Hoeven  
Hoffman  
Hollifield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Huddleston  
Hull  
Hyde  
Ikard  
Jarman  
Jenkins  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearns  
Kee  
Kelly, N. Y.

Keogh  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
King  
Kirwan  
Kitchin  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Knutson  
Krueger  
Landrum  
Lane  
Lankford  
LeCompte  
Lennon  
Lesinski  
Libonati  
Long  
Loser  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McDonough  
McFall  
McGovern  
McIntire  
McIntosh  
McMillan  
McVey  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Malliard  
Matthews  
May  
Meador  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Mills  
Minshall  
Mitchell  
Montoya  
Moore  
Morano  
Morgan  
Morris  
Morrison  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmers  
Passman  
Patman  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Pilcher  
Poage  
Polk  
Porter  
Powell

Preston  
Price  
Prouty  
Quile  
Rabaut  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riley  
Rivers  
Robeson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rutherford  
Sadlak  
Santangelo  
Saund  
Saylor  
Schwengel  
Scott, N. C.  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sikes  
Siler  
Simpson, Ill.  
Sisk  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Stauffer  
Sullivan  
Talle  
Teague, Tex.  
Teller  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, N. J.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Ullman  
Vank  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Vinson  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Walter  
Watts  
Weaver  
Westland  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wier  
Williams, Miss.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Wolverton  
Wright  
Yates  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki  
Zelenko

Teague, Calif.  
Tewes  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Tuck

Utt  
Vorys  
Wharton  
Widnall

Wigglesworth  
Withrow

NOT VOTING—29

Bolton  
Boykin  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Dempsey  
Dies  
Durham  
Eberharter  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Grant  
Green, Pa.  
Hardy  
Hillings  
James  
Mumma  
Murray  
Radwan  
Rains  
Roberts  
Scott, Pa.  
Shuford  
Sieminski  
Steed  
Taylor  
Udall  
Williams, N. Y.

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mrs. Bolton.  
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Radwan.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. James.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Hillings.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Burdick.  
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Bush.  
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Williams of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 501, Rept. No. 1496), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Select Committee on Small Business may sit during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the business recession in the United States continues to snowball as thousands of additional wage earners are furloughed from their jobs. Many of us have foreseen the present economic condition, but try as we would, we could not seem to convince the administration that the situation was really serious.

It is indeed regrettable that millions of people must suffer because of this administration's disregard for the average workman and his family. These people certainly are not to blame for this recession. They want to work and provide a comfortable way of life for their loved ones, but just how can they when they cannot find jobs.

The city of Philadelphia has been hard hit by this recession. I personally know of thousands of families in my Congressional District who are having a difficult time making ends meet. I have tried to help these men and women obtain other employment—and it is a difficult task because there just are not any jobs to be had for love nor money.

When the administration announced its intentions to economize, I knew we were heading for some difficult times. One by one the Federal installations in Philadelphia notified their employees that a reduction in force of present operating personnel was necessary for economic reasons. These agencies, however, assured their personnel that they would be placed in other positions in other Government agencies in the area. While it is true some were absorbed by attrition, the majority were turned out in the streets to fend for themselves. Many of these unfortunate victims had more than 15 years of Government service to their credit. They still have not found work and are depending on public assistance grants or unemployment compensation.

Unemployment in January rose by more than 1 million and today over 5 million citizens are out of jobs. And there are 2 million or more wage earners who are really half employed because they are working only 2 or 3 days a week. With salaries cut off or reduced, these people face stark economic privation unless we pass some constructive legislation within the next month or so.

I believe this economic slump demands the full attention of our President and this administration, but in all honesty to Mr. Eisenhower, I must say that I do not think he is completely aware of the seriousness of the situation. I am convinced he has received bad advice from his economic and financial observers, who are deliberately hiding the truth from him.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the executive branch of the Government stops catering to the rich, the big bankers, the big-business men, and devote some time and efforts to the average Americans. It is

Abbitt  
Adair  
Alger  
Arends  
Ayres  
Bass, N. H.  
Becker  
Betts  
Bosch  
Bow  
Breeding  
Broomfield  
Brown, Ohio  
Brownson  
Budge  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Clevenger  
Collier  
Coudert  
Cramer  
Cunningham, Nebr.  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.

NAYS—81

Dague  
Derounian  
Dwyer  
Frelinghuysen  
Griffin  
Gross  
Gwinn  
Hallock  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Haskell  
Henderson  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Jackson  
Jonas  
Kean  
Kearney  
Keating  
Kilburn  
Lafore  
Lalrd  
Latham  
Lipscomb

McCulloch  
McGregor  
Marshall  
Martin  
Mason  
Michel  
Miller, N. Y.  
Nimtz  
Ostertag  
Pillion  
Poff  
Ray  
Rees, Kans.  
Riehlman  
Robison, N. Y.  
St. George  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scrivner  
Sheehan  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Kans.  
Taber

still not too late providing, of course, that immediate steps are taken. Instead of hoping the economy will somehow revive itself, these officials should unite with the Congress in undertaking a bold economic program to get rid of unemployment and get us out of this recession.

Although I hope that the administration will join with us, I do not think the Congress can take the risk of waiting. We must act now to prevent this recession from spiraling further downward. We have learned a lot about our economy and we know that we do not need to sit idly by and see it toboggan to lower and lower levels of activity.

For one thing, we should immediately cut taxes substantially so that we can increase the purchasing power of the consumer. This is the best way to increase the market for the goods of industry.

Second, we should prevail upon the Federal Reserve Board to go even further in removing all vestiges of the tight money policy which was the main culprit in bringing on the present slump.

We must pass special legislation to take care of all depressed economic areas.

We must undertake an immediate program of public works. This will stimulate our economy, provide increased employment and also increase our national stock of desirable and useful community projects.

These are but a few steps we can and must take. Gentlemen, I cannot impress upon you more the urgency for immediate action. This recession must be stopped in its tracks before it becomes a full-fledged Hoover-type depression.

#### TO ESTABLISH A UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the American people is now being focused on proposals for a summit meeting with the Soviets. In our concern with this problem we may overlook the State of our diplomatic relations far below the summit, on the level of the day-to-day work of our Foreign Service officers. The United States is today a superpower with responsibilities that girdle the globe, but we are limping along with a Foreign Service that is equipped to serve a minor power with only limited interests in the world beyond its own shores. It is not simply a question of giving more ambassadorial posts to professional Foreign Service men rather than to political appointees within the Foreign Service corps itself, there is a critical lack of American experts on the languages and people of the Middle East and all of Asia. It is a shocking truth that all too many of our diplomatic representatives are unable even to speak the language of the country in which they are stationed. They are highly capable people who work with the utmost dedication.

But they work in foreign lands about which many of them know little. It is for these reasons that I call on both Houses of Congress to take steps to build a more highly skilled and effectively trained diplomatic corps. Specifically, my resolution, H. R. 4420, urges the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy, similar to the Military, Naval, and Air Academies.

The bill provides for the location of the academy in or near Washington, D. C., under the supervision of the Secretary of State. It is to offer a 4-year course leading to the bachelor's degree. Entrance would be based on competitive examinations. Instruction at the academy would give special emphasis to the history, sociology, government, and language of the nations in which the diplomatic cadets elect to serve. There would be a substantial period of time set aside for field training in these particular foreign countries. The cadets, or students, would be entitled to quarters and subsistence. Upon graduation they would be given preference when the original appointments to the Foreign Service are made. A Board of Visitors consisting of five members from each of the two Congressional Committees on Foreign Affairs would perform the same function as the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

I am convinced that the formation of this academy will make a substantial contribution to improving the quality of our diplomatic corps. It will help provide the country with a gradually expanding pool of trained specialists so vital to the effective conduct of foreign relations today. It may be able to raise the level of instruction received by future Foreign Service officers studying in other American universities by establishing a highly competent and relevant standard of teaching at the academy. The provision of quarters and subsistence will enable many of our bright young men and women to enter the diplomatic corps who might otherwise be barred from it because they cannot afford a college education at a private university. Finally, the establishment of the Foreign Service Academy should help to gain a wider acceptance of the diplomat in American society and an appreciation of the important service he performs for all of us.

The job of representing the United States in foreign lands requires both generalists, those with a broad background, and specialists in particular geographic areas. Modern diplomacy and the international responsibility of the United States combine to make this so. Diplomats are the eyes and ears of our Government abroad. Their observations provide important facts and analysis needed by the Executive in making our foreign policy. Moreover, these men and women serve as interpreters of American life and policies to the people of the foreign country in which they are stationed. This is in addition to the routine but necessary assistance they render American travelers, businessmen, and professional people temporarily resident in the country. On top of it all there is the basic function of diplomacy which is to

achieve a firm understanding of the points of agreement and difference between nations and through negotiations to accommodate these differences whenever possible. All of these tasks have traditionally been performed by generalists. But the rapid changes in the structure of international politics in the last 20 years and in the role the United States plays in the world have changed all this, and created a need for trained specialists as well as generalists.

Until the Second World War international relations usually meant relations within Europe, or at most, relations between European countries, the United States, and Japan. The Second World War was the first truly world war and international relations have become world politics. The United States became a superpower with foreign policy interests in all parts of the world. This means the United States needs people who can speak the languages and who know the people of the Middle East, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and parts of Africa as well as Europe. The simple truth is that we don't have enough of them.

Today the geographical area specialist has come into his own and has become the backbone of an effective Foreign Service. Our foreign relations have become highly complex and involve contacts with more than 80 different states. Our diplomatic staffs in the capitals of the more important countries must include experts on the economics, politics, and military affairs of the particular nation and on cultural and public relations. The State Department is now again planning to add science attachés and there are still other types of experts required in certain countries.

It is all well and good to say that what the Foreign Service needs are mature men and women with a broad background who can fit into any situation with ease and ability. These we certainly need. But the capable generalist is not an adequate substitute for an economist when our Government needs an accurate analysis of current trends in the banking system of India. Nor is the generalist an effective alternative to someone who knows Arabic when we are trying to explain American policy to a group of Iraqi businessmen. The perils of being without specialists were amply demonstrated to us recently in Indonesia. Before 1949, when the first American trained especially for Indonesian duty was assigned to our Embassy in Jakarta, all translating was done by Indonesians. In order to please their American employers, the Indonesians had a tendency to interpret everything to sound favorable and pro-American. And it was not until our own area and language specialists began to read Indonesian newspapers and attend sessions of the national legislature that the Embassy learned that strong Communist-inspired anti-American feeling was sweeping the country.

The present program of our Foreign Service Institute gives our diplomatic officers some area training in the 3-month period before they leave on their assignments. But this is far from adequate. A few distinguished American



universities like Columbia, Yale, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Stanford have comprehensive area study programs. But the number of schools offering such studies is insignificant when compared to the total number of our colleges and universities. The quantity of graduates is proportionally small.

The Foreign Service Academy, which I call for in my bill, would concentrate on the training of these sorely needed area specialists. This would be its most important contribution. Indeed, the academy would offer almost unparalleled opportunities for effective area training. The provision for a period of study abroad would be invaluable in giving the student a living knowledge of the land and its people. This combination of concentrated study with experience in the area will be vastly superior to the current practice of a 3-month course at the Foreign Service Institute coupled with random knowledge about the country picked up while the officer is actually on the job.

I do not for a moment suggest that the Foreign Service Academy will replace the area training programs of American universities. Far from it. It will rather fill in the gaps and try to raise the level of all the other individual programs. The academy could emphasize training in those areas of the world where we currently have our greatest lack of specialists. The academy's area programs would also be set up to meet the particular needs of the United States Government Foreign Service. They would require the highest standards of intellectual performance by the cadet students and by drawing on the total resources of the Nation through the Government, would establish a standard of excellence to which private area study programs might aspire. The end result should be a substantial increase in both the number and quality of area specialists.

The provision of quarters and subsistence for the diplomatic cadets will enable the United States to secure the services in the diplomatic corps of more of our bright young men and women who might otherwise be unable to secure the college education needed by a Foreign Service officer. It will also have the important side result of making a contribution to the general problem of opening the doors of higher education to more of our young people. It is appalling that so many of our talented high school graduates are unable to continue their education because they lack the \$6,000 to \$8,000 it now takes to spend 4 years in the average private college or university. The State universities usually offer an education at a much lower cost to local residents, but there are not enough facilities and faculty to provide for the growing lists of capable high school graduates that apply for admission.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Congress to approve this bill, H. R. 4420, which provides for the establishment of the United States Foreign Service Academy. I am convinced it will help meet a crucial need in our diplomatic corps for the trained area specialist and that it will contribute to giving our Foreign Service the proper recognition it is due

for the important role it plays in defending and extending the interests of the Nation. Nor should we forget the role the Academy can take in raising the level of instruction in the area study programs of private American colleges, or the assistance that it will give in educating more of our talented young men and women who are denied a college education today by its great cost. Most important of all, the Foreign Service Academy will help close the yawning gap that now exists between the job our diplomatic corps must do and the resources at its disposal.

#### RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT MUST BE AMENDED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this date I have introduced a bill to extend the benefit period under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act from the present 26 weeks to 39 weeks with the cost of such extension to be borne by the Treasury of the United States in the same manner as President Eisenhower proposes to pay the cost of extending for 13 weeks unemployment compensation benefits in other industries.

At the moment thousands of unemployed railroaders throughout the Nation are now receiving an average of \$40 a week from the railroad unemployment insurance fund and many of these unemployed persons have exhausted or are about to exhaust their eligibility for such benefits leaving them and their families without any income.

Mr. Speaker, in the central Pennsylvania area where my Congressional District is located nearly 15 percent of the area's 91,000 labor force is unemployed including railroaders.

Since plans are already afoot to extend unemployment compensation benefits an additional 13 weeks in the various States to those unemployed outside the railroad industry, my bill is necessary in amending the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide an additional 13 weeks of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is emergency legislation and should receive prompt Congressional approval, thus relieving the desperate plight of thousands of unemployed railroaders not only in my Congressional District but throughout the Nation.

#### BELIEVE IN AMERICA WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the power of one little candle has been dramatically demonstrated in my home city of Paterson, N. J., where 2 weeks ago the publisher of the Paterson Evening News, Mr. Harry B. Haines, printed

an editorial that has snowballed into a nationwide campaign to strengthen America.

His editorial of February 25, calling on the governors of the 48 States to proclaim the week of March 23-29 as Believe in America Week as a prescription to cure the psychosomatic slump in our national economy has evoked a deluge of affirmative response.

Twenty-eight governors already have endorsed the program.

In less than 3 days after the editorial appeared in my hometown paper, Gov. Goodwin Knight, of California, issued his proclamation and urged his fellow governors of "every State in the Union to join in its observance and furtherance."

Gov. James Folsom of Alabama has agreed to issue a similar proclamation.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as well as the two New Jersey Senators, H. ALEXANDER SMITH and CLIFFORD P. CASE, and I have hailed the campaign.

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield calls it a magnificent suggestion.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks agrees that pessimism is unwarranted and says:

I think Mr. Haines' plan to end depression talk, including his Believe in America Week, is praiseworthy.

John A. Park, Jr., a North Carolina financial consultant, says:

This is most timely and can be of tremendous help to the country.

Milton C. Lightner, president, National Association of Manufacturers, says:

There is a great deal to what you say.

Fred Gentile, of West Allis, Wis.:

We need not succumb, depression is the sign of a people's lack of ingenuity to create new horizons.

Carl Saunders, Jackson, Mich., citizen, says:

The President might with wisdom take up the suggestion and enlist millions of people in a Believe in America campaign.

Rev. David Sikes, Buffalo, N. Y.:

You are on the right track.

This is the voice of America speaking, rising up to the challenge of one little candle lighted by the Paterson, N. J., Evening News.

Its steady glow, joined by all those others lighted from it, can dispel the gloom of pessimism and fear and show us the way out of the shadows into a brighter tomorrow.

#### WILL UNITED STATES BE SECOND WITH ATOMIC-POWERED AIRCRAFT?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that by now, 5 months after the successful orbiting of a Russian earth satellite, skepticism about the scientific and technological capability and potential of the Soviet Union would have been dispelled. After sputnik and its companion satellite were launched there was a dramatic surge of interest throughout this country in matters scientific. It appeared that at last we were aware of past shortsightedness and unwarranted overconfidence and that we would take the important steps on the road to survival. We started taking some of those steps.

Then, on Thursday of last week, the President announced a decision which raises serious doubts as to whether some of our leaders have forgotten—if they ever appreciated—the warning of last October. You will remember that in that month of sputnik, the prestige of the United States sagged in the eyes of the world. No longer could we claim uncondemned eminence as a scientific power.

Now the President has set the stage for a repeat performance of that avoidable incident. He says scientific manpower and money will be expended on achieving a militarily practical nuclear-powered aircraft without regard for getting into the sky first with a nuclear-powered airplane. His decision means more delay and gives the Russians a clear edge in the field of atom-powered aircraft. There is an unhappy precedent for this sort of Presidential decision: witness the fumbling of our satellite and missile projects.

The President's advisers have told him that basic problems of shielding the crew from radiation and the weight of the airplane are still to be solved. I agree that there are such problems, but I am convinced after thorough investigation that we have made tremendous advances on these problems and an accelerated program aimed at getting this plane airborne would more quickly solve them.

From the experience of the recent past, we could expect that the appearance of a Soviet nuclear-powered airplane in the sky would produce such a hurry-up program. Why delay when the warning is so evident that the Russians are likely to have this kind of airplane flying within the next few years—perhaps within the next 18 months?

We can well imagine the impact on the world of an American atomic-powered airplane. It could be sent on visits to nations all over the globe as a demonstration of the tremendous potential for peaceful applications of the atom. A so-called militarily practical airplane could never have this value.

There is precious little time in which the President can reconsider his decision. There is still the opportunity for him to exert his influence for the fly-early nuclear aircraft as he did for the nuclear-powered merchant ship in 1955.

I wish to read the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which makes an argument of undeniable logic for the ANP project:

President Eisenhower has assumed personal responsibility for the decision against

the "fly-early" plan to produce the world's first atomic-powered airplane. His letter to Congressman MELVIN PRICE of East St. Louis will be considered unconvincing by anyone anxious to see the Nation first in this field.

The President contends that the "fly-early" plane would clash head on with a more important objective of developing an operational military atomic plane; that it would have little practical utility; that it would divert scarce talent from fundamental problems that must be solved before the military plane can be produced.

Somebody decided that it would not matter if the United States lost the satellite race but after that happened, it mattered no end. The decision against the "fly-early" plane gives Soviet Russia the chance to score another propaganda victory. Why is it folly to push for the first flyable atomic plane when such a craft flying about the world without need to replenish fuel, would draw crowds wherever it went? What better demonstration could there be of America's ability to harness the atom for peaceful purposes?

In 1955 President Eisenhower pushed hard for building an atomic-powered merchant ship to demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy harnessed for the improvement of human living. If an atomic ship was a good ship idea then, what isn't an atomic plane a good idea now?

#### ASSISTANCE TO THE FISHING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry has been fighting a losing battle against unfair competition for many years. It is ironic that its position has been worsened as a result of policies followed by the Federal Government. In a government as large and complex as ours, these contradictions happen, but that is no reason why they should be ignored.

Our fishing industry is not seeking price supports or subsidies, but it does need that form of assistance that will eliminate unfair competition and enable it to become self-reliant.

The Congress is aware of the problems that beset our fishing industry, and is most anxious to help. Under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act it has provided research funds for the Department of the Interior. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 created a separate organization to explore the problems of the commercial fisheries industry. Over the long haul, we expect constructive results from such legislation.

But direct assistance is needed to prevent the collapse of this essential industry. Tariff relief has been denied, as our fishing industry has been sacrificed in order to maintain harmonious trade relations with our NATO allies.

To satisfy our shipbuilding industry, regulations require that fishing vessels must be built in the United States, even though they could be built much cheaper in foreign countries.

In both cases, we can go along with such policies up to a certain point, but when our fishing industry is threatened with extinction, we must insist on other measures to rescue it from disaster.

These measures I shall outline later, when I refer to the bill I have introduced to provide such assistance.

Meanwhile, to round out the picture of this industry's distress, I bring to your attention the strange way in which some of our foreign aid boomerangs against our domestic industry. It is a disturbing fact that some of the technical and economic aid we extend to our allies is used to assist their own fishing industries to the detriment of ours. Furthermore, our foreign competitors are heavily subsidized by their own governments, undermining the competitive position of our industry even in the United States market.

In 1948, imports of groundfish fillets totaled 54 million pounds.

By 1957, these imports had increased to 141 million pounds.

Conversely, due to unfair competition from abroad, domestic production that totaled 138 million pounds in 1948, declined to 95 million pounds in 1957. Landings at the port of Boston have dropped 74 percent in the last 17 years.

While the prices the fishermen must pay for their nets, steel, and oil, and so forth, have steadily climbed year after year, the money they receive for their catches has been frozen near the 1945 level.

As profits have vanished, so has the capital available for maintenance and modernization of vessels and equipment. This has hiked insurance costs. The fishing processors, likewise, are caught between this vise of rising costs, and falling profits that often turn into dead-weight losses.

The fishing industry does not want to ride on the Government's back. It seeks only that help that will give it a fighting chance. It is doing its utmost to avoid any quota or price support system. This commendable spirit is worthy of our complete cooperation.

The bill contains these four major provisions:

First. Incentives to reduce vessel insurance costs.

Second. Construction differential subsidies for vessels built in American yards, for the American fishing industry.

Third. A loan program for the repair and modernization of processing plants.

Fourth. Incentive payments for both fishermen and processing plants. With foreign-processed fish selling for about 8 cents a pound less than that caught and processed by our own industry, it is imperative that we take constructive action to insure the survival of a basic enterprise.

#### DEMOCRATIC PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago President Eisenhower in



one of his recently recurring chins-up speeches assured us that the country would see a turnaround in the employment situation when the March figures on employment and unemployment were released. This has not been the case. The January figures showed 4½ million people were fully unemployed. The figures just released show that there are over 5,100,000 fully unemployed. Added to this, of course, are those workers who are only employed on a part-time basis. These add up to roughly another 1¼ million fully unemployed, giving us a total of fully unemployed which runs about 6,400,000. When we consider that of our total civilian labor force of 67 million, 10 million of this number is self-employed, we realize the serious proportion of our employee labor force which is unemployed—over 11 percent.

In addition to this it is anticipated that capital expenditures for plant and equipment will continue to decline as will be manifested in the figures to be released very shortly by the Department of Commerce. On top of this the index of industrial production continues to fall and consumer spending is falling off as indicated by declining retail sales.

We Democrats have made every effort to get the Eisenhower administration to take off its blinders and take drastic, affirmative action to head off a serious recession.

Unfortunately, about the only answer we have got has been "chins-up" speeches. We are all too familiar with this "prosperity just around the corner" approach and have reason to fear its consequences.

The time for action is now at hand. The consequences to be expected from an economic depression are so grave, and the wages in human misery so high, that the administration should have taken advantage of every economic tool available to it before now. The leadership in the Congress must fill the vacuum created by the administration, and this means that, as usual, the Democrats lead and the Republicans follow.

Last week the Democratic leadership in the Congress moved affirmatively and constructively to bolster our sagging economy. Today Chairman MILLS of the House Committee on Ways and Means and I have introduced legislation providing for continued unemployment compensation benefit payments to those workers who have exhausted or will exhaust their benefit payments. Our bills will continue benefit payments for a period of 16 weeks in an amount which is 50 percent of the worker's weekly wage but not to exceed two-thirds of the average wage in the particular State. This means that in every State of the Union in accordance with State law those benefiting from the passage of this law will receive higher unemployment compensation.

In August of last year, the late beloved chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Jere Cooper, with the foresight for which he was renowned, and aware of the beginnings of the present decline in the economy, announced general tax revision hearings to be held

beginning the first day of this session of the Congress. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], upon assuming the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means, carried out these hearings and upon their conclusion directed the Congressional staffs to analyze the various recommendations made by representatives of business organizations and by individuals who appeared before the committee so that the committee would be in a position to move promptly in the tax area if it should be decided that this was necessary. Various alternative means of tax reduction have been prepared by the Congressional staffs for the consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Democratic leadership in the Congress will be prepared to act if it becomes evident that such action along tax lines is needed.

We expect to move very promptly on the Mills-McCormack unemployment compensation bill. As I have stated, we will have ready for action a tax-reduction program which will help restore our economy to an upward growth, if and when it is needed.

I might say that the bills introduced by Chairman MILLS and myself will do a great deal in stimulating our national economy. This help will go where it will bring about the greatest amount of recovery.

May I also say that the Committee on Ways and Means will give very prompt and careful consideration to the bills and undoubtedly in their consideration will be able to make amendments that will strengthen the bills in some respects that had not been considered by Chairman MILLS and me when we introduced the bills.

The need for action is very imperative. We find a situation where the forces of deflation which were deliberately brought about by the present administration are accompanied by inflation, a most unusual situation. It is imperative that action be taken, and on the Congressional level the Democratic leadership intends to give our people and our country the leadership and the action that is necessary.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not true that my friend, the distinguished majority leader, and I, when we introduced this bill are concerned with the situation which prevails throughout the country and which will prevail with respect to those individuals who are unemployed and who have exhausted their benefits under the State programs, pending the time that these public works programs or other projects can be completed by Congressional action?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. That is vitally important. Some of the programs will take some time and the introduction of the bills by Chairman MILLS whose leadership is outstanding, and myself, recognize the immediate situation, and the stimulus that the passage of the bills we have introduced will bring to our national economy. We need a constantly ex-

panding economy of about 4 percent a year in order to meet the demands placed upon our country and upon our people, having in mind the 1,500,000 or so new individuals who come on the labor market each year, together with the other factors which are necessary to keep our economy expanding. One thing is certain—the charge could definitely be made, that the present administration is guilty of deliberately curtailing our expanding economy because of their alleged fear of inflation, which if that did happen, should be met in another direction. But, at the present time they have brought about the forces of deflation while on the other hand the forces of inflation are in operation.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I congratulate our great majority leader and the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. This is the most direct solution that has been offered to a critical problem. It is a solution to provide relief where it is hurting the most and where the need for relief is most urgent; is that not true?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. I might also say that if a tax bill is considered necessary in the near future, and every indication points in that direction, I am confident that the measure reported out of the committee—the Democratic measure—will have the same situation in mind, namely, that the most effective way to bring about the business stimulus that is necessary for our country and for our people is through action in relation to those in the lower income tax groups.

Mr. ALBERT. I congratulate my leader on that statement, but I would like to add this. Tax relief will do no good for the man who has no job and no income. But this proposition will immediately and directly help the man who needs help the most. I would like to add further that our great speaker and our great leader were here when the magnificent program of the Roosevelt administration and the Democratic Congresses of the 1930's brought us out of a deep depression over 20 years ago. They have the skill and the experience needed to meet the current crises.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is interesting to note that every time the Republicans are in control of the Government somehow or at sometime during the time that they are in control, the country suffers from a decline in business—and there is bad business or poor business—with resultant unemployment of our people. I hope that President Eisenhower and my Republican friends will cooperate with us Democrats in meeting this Republican made recession.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) on account of official business.

Mr. DURHAM (at the request of Mr. WHITENER) for the 10th, 11th, and 12th of March on account of death in the family.

#### 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. PASSMAN, for 55 minutes, on March 19.  
Mr. CEDERBERG, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, March 18.  
Mr. CANFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PRICE, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. LANE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WILSON of California, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include a speech.  
Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.  
Mr. FINO.  
Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.  
Mr. GWINN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.  
(At the request of Mr. SILER:)  
Mr. BURDICK and to include extraneous matter.  
Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.  
Mr. ALGER.  
Mr. MAY.  
(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK:)  
Mr. FOGARTY and to include extraneous matter.  
Mr. DELLAY and to include extraneous matter.  
Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1958, 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:

1698. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting certain plans for works of improvement, pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 1005), and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1699. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting copy of the Air Force's semi-annual report entitled "Semi-Annual Re-

search and Development Procurement Action", for the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, in compliance with section IV, Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1700. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes,'" approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1701. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of procedures for canceling production of excess aircraft jet engines in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in title 10, section 2313 (b), United States Code; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1702. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and supplement the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9369. A bill to authorize refunds by the Veterans' Administration of amounts collected from former servicemen by the Government pursuant to guaranty of life insurance premiums under the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 1491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 226. Concurrent resolution designating the 7-day period beginning March 16, 1958, as "National Library Week"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 501. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9821, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 280. An act for the relief of Agapito Jorolan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9989. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the Sons of Union Vet-

erans of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 11303. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 11304. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 11305. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11306. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between International Falls, Minn., and Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11307. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 11308. A bill to permit the use of foreign-built hydrofoil vessels in the coastwise trade of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11309. A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11310. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 11311. A bill to amend section 102 (b) (1) of title 28 of the United States Code to provide that a term of the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan shall be held at Lansing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer, with adjusted gross income of \$7,500 or less, a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 11313. A bill to amend section 401 (c) of the act of June 10, 1955, as amended, with respect to the salaries of postal transportation service substitutes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 11314. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 11315. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 11316. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to



practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 11317. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 11318. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11319. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to make the transitional parity formula inoperative for basic agricultural commodities for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 11320. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 11321. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. R. 11322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 11323. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 11324. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 11325. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 11326. A bill to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 11327. A bill to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11328. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the refund of duties paid on certain merchandise stolen while in the custody of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11329. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize loans under the college housing loan program for the construction of science buildings and libraries at educational institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 11330. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 11331. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code

so as to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 11332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first \$1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 11334. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11335. A bill to provide for the temporary supplementation of State unemployment insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11336. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction of county agricultural centers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 11337. A bill to enable the States to provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11338. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as temporarily to increase from 130 to 195 the maximum number of days of unemployment, within a benefit year, for which unemployment benefits may be paid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 11339. A bill to prohibit Government agencies to acquire or use the National Grange headquarters site without specific Congressional approval; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11340. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11341. A bill to amend the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1958, to permit price differentials for relieving economic distress in certain cases; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 11342. A bill to regulate foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions of the importation of women's fur felt hats and hat bodies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 11343. A bill to stabilize and "freeze" as of January 1, 1958, the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11344. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 11345. A bill to repeal the laws relating to the publication of the Official Reg-

ister; to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 11346. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Massachusetts among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. J. Res. 571. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to discontinue executive appointments of Senators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 572. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 19, 1958, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 573. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing of proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the Maria L. Sanford statue; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. Res. 502. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Washington's Farewell Address"; to the Committee on House Administration.

## 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 West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to aid air traffic in West Virginia by providing or helping to provide increased navigational and landing aids at West Virginia airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the Legislature of West Virginia hereby acknowledges its sincere mourning at the passing of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, its distinguished West Virginian; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 11347. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hatridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11348. A bill for the relief of Sime Bozicevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11349. A bill for the relief of Sime Fatovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 11350. A bill for the relief of Louise Drab, Stanley Drab, and Anton Drab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 11351. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Piazza, doing business as the Northeastern Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 11352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia Kwasniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 11353. A bill for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 11354. A bill for the relief of Maria Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 11355. A bill for the relief of Tarsem Singh Sihota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11356. A bill for the relief of Raphael De Anda Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11357. A bill for the relief of Miss Terez Csencsits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11358. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### March 15, Hungarian Freedom Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, March 15, 1848, was a significant day for the Hungarian people. After centuries of being tied to Austria, these people finally won some measure of freedom. Inspired by the French Revolution of the same year and under the leadership of the famed Louis Kossuth, the Hungarians laid their demands before the Austrian Emperor. In a charter of freedom the right of equality of public duties, the abolition of serfdom, and an enlarged public representation in political affairs were gained. The most important achievement, however, was the right to create a Hungarian national government. With this reform came freedom and national autonomy. Though the future brought disaster and the loss of this freedom and independence, the people never gave up hope of regaining what had been lost. The victorious Freedom Day of March 15, 1848, would never be forgotten by the Hungarian people.

The next 100 years were hard ones for this nation of freedom-loving people. The boundaries of the country were shifted time and again, until at times they could not even be defined. Occupied by the Soviet Union in 1945, Hungary found its freedom crushed again by a foreign yoke. But even after more than a decade of intense Communist indoctrination the hope for freedom continued to burn in the hearts of the Hungarian people. The youth of the country, torn between loyalty to the foreign-dominated government and loyalty to genuine national independence, showed the world the strength of their belief in freedom. The Communist failure to destroy the ideals of the Hungarian forefathers, revealed itself in the October 1956, youth-led revolution. Once again the Hungarian people rebelled against foreign rule. Once again they demanded freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the freedom day victory of 1848 was not repeated. Although these inspired patriots fought desperately to overthrow the despised regime, they were no match for Soviet tanks and artillery. The revolt was suppressed but no show of arms, however great, could suppress the desire for freedom.

Thousands of Hungarians, unwilling to remain any longer under a regime

which denied them their natural rights left their native land and sought freedom elsewhere. A government which denied the existence of God, the sanctity of the family and the dignity of the human being could hardly command the respect of a people who throughout their history have valued these ideas so highly.

Today, 110 years since that first Hungarian freedom day the hope of another day of liberation lives in the hearts of these people wherever they may be. For those who have found freedom in our country and in other lands are united with those who have remained behind in Hungary to continue the fight. They are united in the hope for another Hungarian freedom day. With faith in the guidance of God, and love for their native land they look to the future for a fulfillment of that hope.

### Depression and Prosperity Start at the Grassroots

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, when we think this economic situation through, I feel certain that many Members of this body will agree that both prosperity and depressions originate at the grassroots and that the best antidote for the present unfortunate circumstances in which millions of Americans now find themselves is a return to the principles of economy and frugality in public as well as private affairs. I believe we have been taking too much purchasing power away from the American people for too long a time.

Now is the time to curb big government and big spending as well.

It is a cardinal principle of economics that the wealth of a nation consists of those things useful to man individually or society collectively.

In a true sense wealth can only be created by the application of labor with or without tools to the resources of the earth. For example, a tree in a forest is a natural resource. So, too, is the coal in the ground. A person can sit under a tree and enjoy the comfort of its shade. He may contemplate the coal in the ground but that will not keep him warm when wintertime comes.

However, if man, using the crudest of tools, cuts down the tree and fashions

its parts into a handle for his ax or a mine prop, by this application of labor he has converted the natural resource into something useful to, or usable by, man. So having converted the resource into a useful commodity the commodity so created becomes available in trade, it now has a value and can be symbolized as wealth.

Where wealth is created over and above the normal consumptive demands in the form of capital, producer, and consumer goods, the accumulated excess serves as a deterrent to further production, and normally will cause a lowering of values.

We in the United States are now witnessing the spectacle of lowered production because of the \$90 billion inventory of capital, producer and consumer goods now in the hands of the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of our country. And the more than \$8 billion of surplus agricultural commodities held under loan or owned outright by the Commodity Credit Corporation has acted to depress the commodity markets for American farmers.

In attempting to analyze the present depression, I have given much thought to the millions of Americans now caught in a trap of debt and taxes from which there will be no relief except by the exercise of frugality and economy in all public and private affairs. The tax burden that has been heaped upon the American people at Federal, State, and local levels takes approximately 30 percent of our national income. The more than \$350 billion in known private debts, coupled with \$325 billion in public debt takes nearly \$25 billion of the national income for interest alone.

The inflation which has lowered the purchasing power of the dollar from 82.5 cents in 1946 to approximately 48 cents today has wrought havoc with the value of life-insurance policies, investments, and savings of practically every kind.

Burdened with taxes and wallowing in a morass of debt the people down at the grassroots are trying valiantly to get their noses above water and out of debt. So as they pay their debts, they are restricting their purchasing and business is bad and the inventories are not moving like they used to when money and credit was so easy to get and use.

Now there is another facet to this depression which deserves some attention.

During the past 12 years our taxpayers have been called upon to provide some \$73,690,000,000 in foreign grants and credits. This is \$20 billion more than we spent from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of our own people. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, that a table showing the ex-